

CLAREMONT SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

FRAGMENTATION, INTEGRATION, TRANSFORMATION:  
SYNTHESIZING PROCESS THOUGHT AND ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY TO  
CONSTRUCT A TRANSFORMATIVE RELATIONAL-IMAGINAL PRAXIS FOR PSYCHO-  
SPIRITUAL WHOLENESS AND FLOURISHING

A Dissertation  
presented to  
the Faculty of  
Claremont School of Theology  
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

BY  
SHERI D. KLING

CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

MAY 2017







This dissertation completed by

**SHERI D. KLING**

has been presented to and accepted by the  
faculty of Claremont School of Theology in  
partial fulfillment of the requirements of the

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

**Faculty Committee**

Philip Clayton, Chairperson

Roland Faber

Kelly Bulkeley

**Dean of the Faculty**

Sheryl A. Kujawa-Holbrook

**May 2017**

To Joyce Rockwood Hudson, Jerry Wright, Lynnsay Buehler, Kent Lang (in memorium),  
Chiquita Berry (in memorium) and Angela Moore (in memorium), all of whom loved and  
mentored me through the most important decades of my spiritual life thus far.

## Contents

|   |      |
|---|------|
| List of Tables .....  | viii |
| Acknowledgements.....   | ix   |
| Abstract .....  | xi   |
| Introduction.....   | 1    |
| Experience.....   | 1    |
| Methodologies.....  | 6    |
| Core Commitments .....  | 10   |
| Overarching Conceptual Framework.....                                   | 12   |
| Motivation.....   | 17   |
| Part I: Fragmentation .....   | 19   |
| Chapter 1: A House Divided.....   | 19   |
| Introduction.....   | 19   |
| A Divided People.....   | 22   |
| A Divisive Culture .....  | 29   |
| Summary .....   | 46   |
| Chapter 2: Integrating Resources.....                                   | 48   |
| Introduction.....   | 48   |
| Why Them, Why Now? .....  | 49   |
| Whitehead and Jung.....   | 53   |
| Resonances.....   | 55   |
| Contrasts .....   | 64   |
| Critiques and Responses .....   | 69   |
| Limitations and Project Requirements.....                               | 83   |
| Summary .....   | 87   |
| Part II: Integration: Theoretical, Empirical, Practical.....            | 90   |
| Chapter 3: Theoretical: An Integrated, Relational Cosmos .....          | 90   |
| Introduction.....   | 90   |
| Worldviews: Wounding and Healing.....                                   | 91   |
| Ontological Foundations .....   | 95   |
| The Beginnings of Experience: Dead Past and Living Immediacy .....      | 114  |
| Transpersonal Reality: Dipolar God, Mutual Immanence, and Novelty ..... | 130  |
| Summary .....   | 140  |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 4: Empirical: An Integrated, Relational Psyche .....                                     | 142 |
| Introduction.....  | 142 |
| Psychological Foundations .....  | 142 |
| The Depths of Experience: Primordial Life and Objective Psyche .....                             | 165 |
| Transpersonal Reality: Collective Unconscious, Archetypal Imagination and the God-Image .....    | 168 |
| Summary .....  | 180 |
| Chapter 5: Practical: The Integrative Power of Dreams .....                                      | 181 |
| Introduction.....  | 181 |
| A Psychological View of Dreams .....   | 184 |
| A Scientific View of Dreams .....  | 197 |
| A Communal View of Dreams .....  | 218 |
| A Mystical View of Dreams .....  | 225 |
| Summary .....  | 234 |
| Chapter 6: Synthesis .....   | 236 |
| Introduction.....  | 236 |
| Functional Resonances.....   | 236 |
| Transpersonal Reality and Historical Pressure .....  | 239 |
| Generative Synthesis: A Relational-Imaginal Reality of Form and Freedom .....                    | 254 |
| Summary .....  | 260 |
| Part III: Transformation .....   | 262 |
| Chapter 7: Construction .....  | 262 |
| Introduction.....  | 262 |
| God and World: Perception and Dreaming.....  | 263 |
| Teleology and an Immanent God.....   | 294 |
| Summary .....  | 315 |
| Chapter 8: Transformation.....   | 316 |
| Introduction.....  | 316 |
| A Transformative Relational-Imaginal Praxis for Psycho-Spiritual Wholeness and Flourishing ..... | 317 |
| The Lived Experience of Christian Dream Workers: A Qualitative Study .....                       | 334 |
| Summary .....  | 341 |
| Conclusion .....   | 343 |
| Bibliography .....   | 350 |

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Brain regions involved in dreaming

Table 2: Hoss's findings



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank my dissertation committee for their inspiration and guidance as I have been going through this process. My deepest gratitude goes to my advisor Philip Clayton for being a generous, encouraging, and challenging coach with whom I wanted to work ever since our first meeting at a Religion and Science Student Society event in 2010 at the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago, where I was invited to be a student responder to Dr. Clayton's presentation, and the following weekend's conference at Goshen College where we first discussed my unusual research interests. I could never have made it this far without his expertise, guidance, and flexibility. Upon arrival at Claremont School of Theology in 2011, I was immediately awed by the knowledge that seemed to exude from every one of Roland Faber's pores. Every opportunity to work with Dr. Faber in classes and events related to process theology has opened my eyes to new perspectives on the field and pushed me to clarify my own. I feel privileged to have learned from him. Having come to know Kelly Bulkeley and his work through the Psychology, Culture, and Religion Group in the American Academy of Religion and the International Association for the Study of Dreams, I was thrilled when practical theologian and CST professor Kathleen Greider recommended I contact him to be on my committee, and even more so when he agreed. Dr. Bulkeley's work at the intersection of psychology, religion, cognitive science, and dreaming has been key to this project.

I must acknowledge Anna Case-Winters in whose process theology class at McCormick Seminary in Chicago I was first inspired to connect Whitehead with Jung. Other process thinkers who were very influential in my work that must be recognized are John B. Cobb, Jr., David Ray Griffin, Monica Coleman, Marjorie Suchocki, Bruce Epperly, and Jay McDaniel. I would also be remiss were I not to acknowledge the incredibly formative experiences I had with the faculty and

staff of the Lutheran School of Theology at Chicago and Claremont School of Theology. I will not name individuals here because the entire ecosystems of each place and the wise and encouraging professors all contributed to my own “becoming.” In addition, although they would not know me from Adam’s housecat, I feel I must also acknowledge Christian de Quincey in whose book *Radical Nature: the Soul of Matter* I first met Alfred North Whitehead and Clarissa Pinkola Estes in whose book *Women Who Run with the Wolves* I first encountered Carl Gustav Jung.

I would like to acknowledge Sheree Aston and my coworkers in Academic Affairs at Western University of Health Science along with other faculty and staff there who encouraged me in my studies and allowed flexibility in my work schedule. Other significantly formative communities that I would like to thank include the members and current and former staff of the Lutheran Church of the Resurrection in Marietta, Georgia, and all those involved in the Natural Spirituality Regional Gatherings in North Georgia, the Haden Institute Summer Dream and Spirituality Conferences in North Carolina, and the Mythic Journeys conferences in Atlanta. Without all of you, I may not have remained a Christian.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, Richard and Lucille Bayne, my brother, Jeff Kling, and all other family and friends who have walked with me and loved and encouraged me along this serpentine pathway of faith, frustration, and fulfillment.

## ABSTRACT

American culture is fragmented *societally, interpersonally, and intrapersonally*. This dissertation argues that we will solve neither the ecological crisis nor our estrangement from each other and its attendant social ills until we transform our relationship with embodied life and rediscover *within it* what is sacred through transformative *lived experiences* of wholeness. Using an embodied theological framework supported by comparative, hermeneutical, and constructive methodologies, this project synthesizes theoretical, empirical, and practical resources to construct: 1) a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*; 2) a theory of a *relational-imaginal God-Self in the human being*; and, 3) a transformative *relational-imaginal praxis for psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing*. The value of interweaving Whitehead's integrated, relational cosmos with Jung's integrated, relational psyche, and a powerful spiritual praxis of dream work is the realization and *experience* of a God-world reality characterized by *value, relationality, and transformation* in which individuals *matter, belong, and can experience positive change*. Within such a hope-full reality, individuals are thereby capable of moving from a state of fragmentation to one of psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing.

People say that what we're all seeking is a meaning for life. I don't think that's what we're really seeking. I think that what we're seeking is an experience of being alive, so that our life experiences on the purely physical plane will have resonances within our own innermost being and reality, so that we actually feel the rapture of being alive.

—Joseph Campbell, *The Power of Myth*

At its deepest level life is not a problem but a mystery. The distinction is fundamental; problems are solved, mysteries are not. At one time or another, each of us confronts an experience so powerful, bewildering, joyous, or terrifying, that all our efforts to see it as a problem are futile. Each of us reaches the end of reason's rope. And when we do, we can either grip harder and get nowhere, or we can let go, and fall. For what does mystery ask of us? Only that we be in its presence, that we fully, consciously, hand ourselves over. That is all, and that is everything.

—Phil Simmons, 2001

## INTRODUCTION

### EXPERIENCE

“[E]xperiences are the matrix from which we all begin to think theologically.”  
—Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow,  
*Goddess and God in the World: Conversations in Embodied Theology*

“[A]ll theology begins in experience.”<sup>1</sup> So claim Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow in their most recent collaboration, *Goddess and God in the World: Conversations in Embodied Theology*. In other words, the particular perspectives of every theologian are rooted in her or his *lived* and *embodied* experience, and therefore any theological ideas that issue forth are unavoidably springing from the personal and communal wellsprings that her or his body *experienced*. J. Pittman McGehee, a Jungian analyst and Episcopal priest, similarly claims that “All theology is autobiography.”<sup>2</sup> Without argument, I know that what is communicated in this project flows directly and indirectly from the decades that led up to this moment in time and the spatial locations and historical contexts within which I am writing now and have lived throughout my entire life.

Within these pages are echoes of Roselle, New Jersey and West Lafayette, Indiana; of rural northeast Georgia and the booming suburbs of Atlanta; of Hyde Park in Chicago, and Claremont, California. Illuminating its margins are images of an invaluable web of friendships, family joys and sorrows, intra-school racial tensions, troubadour performances throughout the southeastern United States, as well as a temporary sojourn through eight acres of pasture and a

---

<sup>1</sup> Carol P. Christ and Judith Plaskow, *Goddess and God in the World: Conversations in Embodied Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 290.

<sup>2</sup> J. Pittman McGehee and Damon J. Thomas, *The Invisible Church: Finding Spirituality Where You Are* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008), 62.

100-year-old farmhouse complete with picturesque barn and spring peeper calls at twilight. It is all here. Yet it is impossible to deny that the painful experiences—like the irritating sand that presses the oyster into pearl manufacture—are probably what have most motivated my theological study and spiritual practice.

Irritating grains of sand begin to pile up almost immediately when you grow up with a father who suffers deeply from mental illness within a family system that is not capable of acknowledging his unrest. Abandonment, abuse, and rage flow unimpeded downstream from one generation to another, and create eddies of black water along the threatening edges of awareness. All of that lays a broad foundation. But it was my father's suicide when I was only 10 years old that shoved me headlong into an abyss that fractured my personality into far-flung parts of alienation, depression, anxiety, existential loneliness, and frequent despair. That same descent initiated me into mysteries for which I was unprepared emotionally. Years followed during which life centered around denying my own painful bodily reality and retreating into a cerebral and spiritual world where I doggedly maintained that if I could only figure it all out, I could find some sanctuary, some purchase in the material world.

Somewhere along the way, a therapist asked me about my dreams, and I began to see patterns in the images that emerged. I was introduced to Jungian authors who interpreted myths and fairy tales as representing archetypal journeys through psychological terrain, and found that whenever I felt "stuck" in my own journey, a story that seemed to explain everything would suddenly land in my lap. I began to see my life less as a series of random acts of suffering and more as an individual thread in a much larger—and much richer—tapestry. And because the stories never ended in the dark abyss, I began to entertain hope for my own rebirth. Meanwhile, uncanny and deeply meaningful coincidences happened on a regular basis, linking my inner

world to the human and natural world that confronted me. Through such events—what C.G. Jung calls “synchronicities”—I began to believe that the whole world is God’s mouthpiece, that it seemed to see and know me, and that if the world *could* see and know me, then maybe I was not so alone after all.

During this time, I was blessed by a church community that loved and held me with pastors at the helm who engaged me in theological discussions (or, I should say, who responded enthusiastically to my never-ending prompts). As a naturally curious adult with a commitment to life-long learning, I delved into other religious traditions, read medieval mystics, examined studies at the margins of the new physics, consciousness, and healing, and discovered Marcus Borg, John Shelby Spong, and biblical historical criticism before I even knew the term. Tensions in my theological world began to arise, and frustrations over the Church’s failure to share academic scholarship combined with the increasingly conservative face of public Christianity left me questioning whether or not I could even continue to call myself “Christian.” Around the year 2000, I was introduced to a life-giving spiritual language in Joyce Rockwood Hudson’s book *Natural Spirituality: Recovering the Wisdom Tradition in Christianity*. Hudson weaves Jungian thought and Christianity into a seamless whole that became the means through which I could remain a Christian and, at the same time, introduced me to a community of (primarily) Christian dream workers who meet every year at the Natural Spirituality Regional Gatherings held in north Georgia and the Haden Institute’s Summer Dream and Spirituality Conference held in the mountains of western North Carolina. In these places—as well as in the Mythic Journeys conferences I helped to organize in 2004 and 2006 in Atlanta—I found my spiritual tribe.

There are far more significant dreams, synchronicities, and what might be called religious or even mystical experiences in my life than I can reasonably share here, but there are a few that

I would like to briefly describe in the following paragraphs. One such experience occurred while I was traveling alone in the southwestern United States in 1995 during a brief visit to the Canyon de Chelly National Monument in Arizona. I had just completed a half-day “shake and bake” tour of the Canyon—so named because the open-air truck bounced along the sun-soaked Canyon floor—and decided to visit the overlooks along the canyon rim above. I drove my rented Plymouth to the first overlook and parked it in the empty parking lot. I walked out to the edge of the rim and sat on a rock where I marveled at the beauty hundreds of feet below me—so high up was I that the people walking around below looked like ants and the truck I had just left was the size of a hazelnut. As I watched the hawks flying above me I suddenly entered into a new frame of consciousness wherein I felt to the marrow of my bones that I was infinitesimally tiny in the whole scheme of things yet intimately connected to everything. I *felt* that connection in a way unlike any other insight I had ever had. Just as quickly I was snapped back into regular awareness; I can say with complete certainty that I have spent the rest of my life ever since that moment trying to integrate that experience.

A small synchronicity that has cheered me every time I remember it happened on the grounds of a small college near Asheville, North Carolina where I was attending a music camp in 2003. I had lost my last full-time “day job” in software marketing earlier that year and had spent the summer in an intense period of discernment during which I spent as much time in silence and in nature as I could and also fell deeply in love with a man who had just made it pretty clear that my feelings for him were not mutually reciprocated. I sat on a hillside, wrote in my journal, and wept until I could weep no more, pleading heavenward that I “needed a nature moment.” Suddenly, an entire flock of goldfinches exploded the tree just in front of me into a raucous



celebration of yellow. It may not have been the color purple, but it would surely have pissed God off if I had not smiled.

One more—and this is a series of dreams. Several months before I moved from north Georgia to Chicago to begin my theological studies, I had a dream whose central image was of a huge snake that had been hacked into large pieces—still alive and writhing—and shipped to me in a Styrofoam-style cooler. In the dream, I was horrified, and kept trying to dispose of the thing, even planning to push it down into the large trash compactor at my “old complex” (the condominium community where I had lived for many years; a friend who is a Jungian analyst named that one of the best representations of repression that he had ever heard). For me, the dream was saying that this “transformation stuff” (imaged by the snake who can represent new life) was not what I had “ordered” and not what I wanted. That dream led me to complete my first Hebrew Testament exegetical paper on the snake in the Garden of Eden and the symbolic motif of the tree, the woman, and the snake. It seemed for several months that snake images kept popping up in my studies, and finally, about six months later, I had another dream. This was a simple auditory dream that intoned one sentence: *You will not be resurrected until you allow yourself to be bitten by the snake*. I could not make much headway on how to understand that, so I set the dream aside.

Four years later, during my second year of course work at Claremont School of Theology, I found myself deep in the worst spiritual abyss I had ever encountered. I was wracked with depression, anxiety, health issues, self-doubts and relationship woes that were so intense that I lost all footing in the worldview that I had held for many years. I had long been wrestling with what I knew was a dying God image—that of the demanding and love-denying Father—and questioned whether anything I had ever said or believed about God or dream work or spiritual

practice made any sense or was in any way efficacious. I knew I had to reject this punitive God, and yet I had no idea what would remain if I did. I did not know if there would be any form of faith left in me. At that same time, as I was enrolled in a class on becoming a public scholar, I was asked to articulate a vision and mission for my future work. I told my classmates that I was in the process of breaking up with God—or at least with the abusive-father-bad-boyfriend-God-image that I had come to hold. Bellowing that I was “good enough!” at the heavens felt freeing—and emptying. There was no faith left in me and I entered the silence yet again. It was almost an afterthought when I suddenly realized that in the previous two nights, I had had two dreams, and in each dream, I had been bitten by a snake.

You will not be resurrected until you allow yourself to be bitten by the snake.

That simple awareness of my dream activity caused an intruding of a new kind of faith. A faith in which I no longer needed a specific God image, where it was enough to know deep in my core that there was something bigger than me that loved me, and that whatever That was, It or He or She was working in my life and connecting me to its Heart of Reality.<sup>3</sup>

## METHODOLOGIES

As is standard fare in both process and practical theology, this project is based on questioning the doctrinal assumptions that stress God’s transcendence over God’s immanence in the world. Such an approach fits this project because the particular lived experiences of Christian dream workers are not supported by doctrinal assumptions that preference God’s transcendence. Yet whereas a doctrinal methodology would typically critique and dismiss such lived experience, I assume—as does liberation and feminist theology—that such experience must lead to a

---

<sup>3</sup> Ann Belford Ulanov and Alvin Dueck, *The Living God and Our Living Psyche: What Christians Can Learn from Carl Jung* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008), 69.

reasoned critique of the doctrine. Rosemary Radford Ruether, a preeminent feminist theologian, acknowledges that feminist theology has typically used the experiences of women as a hermeneutical lens. Moreover, she argues forcefully that this consideration of experience as a viable source should not be limited to feminist theology because

What have been called the objective sources of theology; Scripture and tradition, are themselves codified collective human experience. Human experience is the starting point and the ending point of the hermeneutical circle. Codified tradition both reaches back to its roots in experience and is constantly renewed or discarded through the test of experience. 'Experience' includes experience of the divine, experience of oneself, and experience of the community and the world, in an interacting dialectic.<sup>4</sup>

With all apologies to McGehee and Thomas, it would be unacceptable for this project to merely “reduce theology to autobiography;”<sup>5</sup> therefore, I am relieved that Christ and Plaskow name the methodological approach I have been intuitively taking for most of my theological life as the *embodied theological method*.<sup>6</sup> This method is described as “a new way of constructing theologies” that acknowledges such insights as that:

- “Theology is rooted in experience”;
- All religious texts, traditions, and mystical experiences “felt to have revelatory status” are all “received by finite individuals who interpret [such text, traditions and experiences] through their own language and cultural constructs”; and,
- Theologies “can and must be judged by rational and ethical criteria” using measures of consistency, coherence, comprehensiveness, and clarity.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Rosemary R. Ruether, *Sexism and God Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993), 12.

<sup>5</sup> Christ and Plaskow, *Goddess and God in the World*, xiv.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 290–93.

It is the sum total of my own psycho-spiritual-bodily experiences that led me to wind my way to the Claremont School of Theology so as to complete a Ph.D. in Religion with a focus on Process Studies, researching the work of Alfred North Whitehead and various process theologians, alongside that of Carl Gustav Jung. As well, the discoveries made in my own spiritual study and experiences have incited what I believe to be novel theological insights. If it is true, as process theology argues, that God's possibilities or initial aims introduce novelty into the world, and that integration and self-transcendence move us toward Beauty, Harmony, and Value, then it is certainly one task of process theologians to construct new psycho-religious forms that can serve those purposes in a process-friendly spirituality.

Within the broader framework of the *embodied theological method* already described, I have freely used other methodologies depending on the purposes of each chapter. Chapter 1 is primarily *analytical* of the problem as I see it, taking an inductive analytical approach where I use actual experience to develop broader theories. Chapter 2 is primarily *descriptive* of the resources I am bringing to bear on the problem. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 use a *hermeneutical* approach in which I explore the meaning of each of my resources when viewed through the lenses of my core criteria of *value*, *relations/belonging*, and *transformation*. Chapter 6 uses a *comparative* methodology in which I compare the ideas and functions that Whitehead and Jung each describe in proprietary terms to see what fruits emerge from their synthesis. I will not make one-to-one comparisons of the ontological nature of each thinker's concepts but will, instead, claim functional resonances between terms. This is an essential part of this project because both Whitehead and Jung coined their own terminology to describe aspects of reality that are practically impossible to quantify. As their terminology is inherently metaphorical, my approach (explained in Chapter 2), therefore, finds it less helpful to pit, for example, Whitehead's *eternal*

*objects* directly against Jung's *archetypes*, and more helpful to reach deeply into each term to understand how it *functions* and then to compare those functions to discuss ways in which they are *resonant*.

Chapters 7 and 8 are primarily *constructive* chapters where I develop new theories and practices. Here I construct new theories of dreaming and of the God-Self in the psyche, drawing from Whiteheadian and Jungian resources while combining those resources in novel ways to create a generative synthesis that is more robust and liberative than existing alternatives and that supports the creative transformation of individuals and communities toward wholeness and flourishing. Paraphrasing Stanley R. Hopper, I am writing here neither as a strict Whiteheadian nor as a strict Jungian; I am arguing neither as a philosopher nor an analyst; I am not even constructing this project as an ensiled theologian. Rather, I am "trying to explore a zone or an environment in which [these various] modes of thinking might find some common ground."<sup>8</sup>

Rather than seeing this project as either "Whiteheadian" or "Jungian" I see it as one that uses Whiteheadian and Jungian resources to reform psycho-spiritual practice. It is therefore key that this project is understood to be inherently *interdisciplinary*. As such, I do not use theology or tradition as the "final arbiter" of the data on experience, but will also draw from process philosophy, Jungian psychology, cognitive research into the dreaming brain, and qualitative research to support my claims. In this interdisciplinary approach, I am being true to both my Whiteheadian and Jungian roots. Whitehead saw religion, philosophy, and science as fields that were all "trying to understand our experience of the actual world,"<sup>9</sup> and therefore could not be

---

<sup>8</sup> Stanley R. Hopper, "Language as Metaphorical: A Reply to John Cobb," in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 129.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas E. Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1993), 232.

separated quite so cleanly as we might be tempted to think. In fact, it was only through “harmonization” of those disciplines that Whitehead believed philosophy could avoid the “taint of ineffectiveness.”<sup>10</sup> Similarly, my approach is grounded in the stance that it is only through a creative and generative synthesis of the disciplines included in this project that a robust and liberative psycho-spiritual praxis may be constructed. An *anthropological* methodology posits spirituality as an “intrinsic part of the human person,” that therefore does not spring from “Christian theological categories, or even from history, but rather from the capacity for spirituality in every individual.”<sup>11</sup> Discussions of the human psyche and how God can be alive there from a psychological standpoint are therefore germane. Here I will include material from various branches of psychology that examine what is called “nondirected thinking” or “primordial experience” and mystical and religious experience and its effects.

I must also note that earlier versions of the comparative material examining Whitehead, Jung, symbolism, and dreams were presented at a conference sponsored by the Whitehead Research Project on Whitehead’s book *Symbolism* and will appear in the forthcoming book *Rethinking Whitehead’s Symbolism: Thought, Language, Culture* to be published by Edinburgh University Press in 2017.

## CORE COMMITMENTS

Having been a regular church-going Lutheran all of my life in churches that were not particularly strident, I avoided the blatant misogyny that is often witnessed in some forms of Christianity; moreover, having grown up with a college-educated mother who generally worked outside the home, I was able to envision possibilities for myself that other women might have

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> David B. Perrin, *Studying Christian Spirituality* (New York: Routledge, 2007), 40.

been denied. So I was unprepared for the torrent of sorrow that engulfed me when I read Rosemary Radford Ruether's *Sexism and God-Talk*. Having been bullied by young girls of color during most of my grade school and high school years, I was unprepared for the flood of compassion that moved through me when I watched the movies "Bamboozled" and "Do the Right Thing" by Spike Lee and read *Jesus and the Disinherited* by Howard Thurman. An immersion in religion & science with a focus on ecology while getting a master's degree exposed me to a multitude of books that spoke of ecological destruction and our human failure to protect the common home we share with all life on this earth, and so I became acutely aware of this suffering too. If it is true, as paraphrased of Leon Bloy, that "there are places in the heart that do not yet exist; pain must be in order that they be," then my heart—along with the hearts of all of humankind—now carries a multitude of places that did not exist on the day I was born. Every single one of those places has contributed to this constructive psycho-spiritual/theological project, and are reflected in its core commitments and in the overarching framework of assumptions upon which it rests.

In this project and in my work overall, I am committed to:

- Valuing lived experience and embodied lives
- Hearing the pain of the world and responding to it
- Expressing ideas about divinity that make sense not only of my own "personal experiences, but also of the world."<sup>12</sup>
- Acknowledging divinity in the world and a God who is both transcendent and immanent

---

<sup>12</sup> Christ and Plaskow, *Goddess and God in the World*, xv.

- Valuing diversity and religious pluralism and recognizing the inherent—not just instrumental—value of all beings, all genders, all races. To that end, I have used inclusive and gender-neutral language in my own writing, and reflected the same in quotations where it did not become too clumsy to do so.
- Integrating life-affirming knowledge discovered through the sciences
- Promoting what I call the *common flourishing* of all beings and ecosystems while focusing on spiritual tools for developing the “fullness of humanity for the flourishing of all”<sup>13</sup>
- Working as a reformist within a Christian paradigm that is not exclusive and is not limited to resources within classical Christian theistic frameworks
- Constructing a viable spirituality that must be robust, liberative, and transformative and that will produce more joy, more love, more compassion, and more wholeness for those who embrace it, and
- Promoting the primary mission of the Church as facilitating deep encounter with God, self, and world based on the assertion that we cannot expect Christians to live as Jesus lived without having the inner spiritual life that Jesus had.

## **OVERARCHING CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

In many ways, this project is a continuation of work that began in 1983 at Claremont School of Theology with conversations between James Hillman, depth psychologists, and process thinkers. Spearheaded by Catherine Keller, who was then a doctoral student, those

---

<sup>13</sup> Philip Clayton and Simpson Zachary, *Adventures in the Spirit: God, World, Divine Action* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 260.



conversations became a volume edited by David Ray Griffin entitled *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine in Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*. At the time, Keller described the project as “the search for the elusive Eros between the cosmology of Alfred North Whitehead and the psychologies of Carl Gustav Jung and James Hillman: the quest of psyche in and for cosmos.”<sup>14</sup> The focus here is less an analysis of the similarities and differences between the two schools of thought—though both are acknowledged—and more an exploration of the *functional commonalities* of the two that can be *generatively synthesized* to construct a *robust and liberative imaginal praxis* that can be enlisted to foster personal wholeness and communal transformation of consciousness.

In the same way that Hillman claims to have found a “third way of doing metaphysics” that he calls “metaphysical *praxis*,”<sup>15</sup> I have found what might be called “embodied psycho-spiritual praxis” to be an effective *perspectival center*<sup>16</sup> to this project. From this center, I argue that the embodied encounter with the collective unconscious—what has been called *primordial experience*—given in such practices as dream work reveals the presence of God in all reality as well as our interwovenness and participation within that sacred reality. From this perspective, God offers novelty and transformation to humans through the God-image in the psyche, and it is this archetypal Self that acts as an activation point where the process or event of God meets the process or event of the human psyche; it is the “thread” in the “net of interwovenness” that connects human and divine and through which creative transformation moves. Therefore, in the “fundamental dynamic” within process theology between what Roland Faber describes as either

---

<sup>14</sup> Catherine E. Keller, “Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine in Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 133.

<sup>15</sup> James Hillman, “Back to Beyond: On Cosmology,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine in Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 218.

<sup>16</sup> Roland Faber, *God as Poet of the World: Exploring Process Theologies* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 14.

the “empiricist” or the “rationalist” orientations, I prioritize the empiricist inclination with its commitment to the world as “characterized by infinite flux,” and seek therefore to positively influence the field of process studies and theology by adding “new empirical elements” drawn from psychology and dream research. Like Marjorie Suchocki, I too understand my own humble revisionism as “serving the soteriological function of all theology.”<sup>17</sup> My personal experience and study has admittedly formed me with a bias toward what I perceive to be valuable within Jungian psychology and the process-relational worldview—I will, therefore, attempt to “bracket” that bias by acknowledging criticisms and limitations within the two systems. As is true of Polly Young-Eisendrath’s and James Hall’s approach to Jung, within this project I will “strive to define and revise [Jung’s and Whitehead’s] ideas according to [my] purposes” in order to “find a new angle of meaning” in the synthesis.<sup>18</sup>

This is an inherently and unapologetically interdisciplinary project that works to creatively and generatively synthesize key resources from the disciplines of theology, philosophy, psychology, and Christian spirituality without being an exhaustive analysis of any one discipline. My approach is not systematic and I am more concerned with being true to what may still be life-giving and transformative within the resources used than with conforming strictly to the traditions or texts within any one field. In a way, this work is an invitation to those interested in process-relational thought, Jungian thought, and spiritual transformation to open their disciplinary borders a bit and come together in an experiential and imaginal effort to do more good in the world.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 17, 37.

<sup>18</sup> Polly Young-Eisendrath and James Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology: A Constructivist Perspective* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1991), 1.

Because of my commitment to interdisciplinarity, it cannot pragmatically be within the scope of this project to exhaustively describe or analyze all of the elements that inform it and so I will name below key assumptions that contribute to the overarching conceptual framework within which this project is constructed.

- The term “God” in this project refers to what John B. Cobb, Jr. calls “a unitary actuality which is supremely worthy of worship and/or commitment”<sup>19</sup> and to what may be described as the primordial mystery at the base of all life. This is the reality that William James described as “working in things rather than above them,”<sup>20</sup> and what Norman Pittenger calls “the cosmic thrust toward good.”<sup>21</sup> While my conception of God is certainly informed by Christian tradition, its contours and characteristics are not strictly limited to those found in that tradition.
- This project assumes a postmodern, liberal-progressive Christian theological foundation which insists that Christianity is not essentially patriarchal (although it is currently manifestly so) and rejects all patriarchal thinking that is dependent upon mind-body dualism and devaluation of the body, the feminine, and the natural world. It also assumes that contemporary liberal theologies—including process-relational, liberation, and eco-feminist theologies—bring necessary and valid critique to the tradition and provide invaluable resources.
- It assumes a relational, panentheistic, and radically incarnational theological framework that presupposes a participatory theory of agency as described by Philip Clayton and

---

<sup>19</sup> John B. Cobb Jr., *God and the World* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969), 20.

<sup>20</sup> Bernard M. Loomer, “The Size of God,” in *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, ed. William D. Dean and Larry E. Axel (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 23.

<sup>21</sup> W. Norman Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love: Human Experience and Christian Faith in a Process Perspective* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1979), 62.

Simpson Zachary,<sup>22</sup> that incorporates the best of liberal theologies without losing what is described as mystical, that incorporates a speculative mindset, and that views God as “empowering, persuading, and saving love” while rejecting descriptions of God as “coercive determiner of history.”<sup>23</sup>

- It assumes a kenotic doctrine of creation<sup>24</sup> and a kenotic Christology (referenced later as present in the process that Jung describes as individuation—a self-kenotic mindset in which the ego bows to the Christ as Archetypal Self to manifest divine action in the world).
- Finally, it assumes that neither the Christian “canon” nor God’s self “revelation” are closed or final.

The circumstances of my birth, the innate abilities and education with which I have been blessed, my access to resources, the histories of my family and social networks, and a myriad of other elements have co-constituted my being in such a way that I speak and write from a specific social and historical location. I am a white, heterosexual woman who grew up in what would probably be described as a lower middle class household with early exposure to people of other faiths and other races. For most of my life, I have had access to pathways and resources that allowed me to pursue college and graduate education and to invest in psychological counseling when needed. I therefore do not claim to speak for all people or even all Christians.

---

<sup>22</sup> Clayton and Zachary, *Adventures in the Spirit*, 204.

<sup>23</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 3.

<sup>24</sup> Clayton and Zachary, *Adventures in the Spirit*, 181.

## MOTIVATION

While pursuing a career as a performing singer and songwriter, I traveled as a troubadour, sharing songs and stories written from personal experience. Time and time again, audience members' reactions confirmed the wisdom that the deeply personal is the most universal. In this project, while I make assertive claims on what ails us in contemporary America and propose a Christian-influenced psycho-spiritual praxis constructed with Whiteheadian and Jungian resources, I do so admittedly through the limited lenses of my own experience and interpretations of the broader context within which I find myself. Therefore, I do not see the alternatives or solutions I propose as universally normative. Similarly, in *A Process Christology*, Griffin refuses to formulate any kind of universal doctrine of salvation that presupposes a "fundamental spiritual problem" that is ontologically true for all of humankind in all times and places. Such a task, frequently undertaken by Christian theologians, would be "impossible, due to the differences between cultures, eras, and individuals."<sup>25</sup> Such a move is not only problematic due to the differences that are ignored, but also because focusing only on an "originating sin" removes other significant factors from consideration. He writes,

But what of the alienation of man's conscious life from the unconscious symbolizations that his civilization has fostered? What of the lack of wholeness fostered by the specialization of civilization, embodied supremely in the assembly line? What of modern man's difficulty in honestly believing there is a divine reality, and, hence, any ultimate meaning to life? These problems can, of course, be interpreted as flowing from some underlying perversity common to man, defined as self-centeredness or pride. But such interpretations seem more ingenious than illuminating.<sup>26</sup>

Like Griffin, I find it to be much more appropriate to "show how the various aspects of [my] theological position are relevant to certain problems that are widespread in the era and tradition

---

<sup>25</sup> David Ray Griffin, *A Process Christology* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973), 18.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

for which [I am] primarily writing, leaving it to writers in other times and places to explicate the significance of the Christian vision of reality for their contexts.”<sup>27</sup> While I am not proscriptive regarding solutions and practices, I do make claims about a metaphysical reality that must be universally available to all humans equally, and I do believe that the arguments made herein will resonate with many people. It is for them that I have hewn the pathway through *Fragmentation*, *Integration*, and *Transformation* that proceeds after this Introduction.

I begin by identifying the problem of Fragmentation, move into comparing and synthesizing resources for Integration, and finally construct theory and practice for Transformation. This *elemental* structure of the project is not its deepest layer because, for me, the fruits of this project must *do real work* in the world. As a result, there is also—alongside this elemental layer—an *existential* layer at which the theoretical, empirical, and practical resources are only useful if they reveal our metaphysical reality to be one that is characterized by *relationality*, *value*, and *transformation*. In other words, our condition of fragmentation will never be healed until we can experience the cosmos as one for which we *matter*, to which we *belong*, and in which we *can experience positive change*. As we traverse the elemental journey, it is my hope that we also realize the existential journey because while dream work is merely one practice that reveals a metaphysical reality of relationality, value, and transformation, *knowing* this God-world reality *in our lived experience* is the real destination.

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 19.

PART I:  
FRAGMENTATION

CHAPTER 1:  
A HOUSE DIVIDED

**INTRODUCTION**

We who currently live in the United States are deeply and painfully divided. Can we not feel this to be true in our very bones? How often do we experience a general sense of personal contentment? How often can we say we bask in the glow of family love and support? Can we equally express strength and vulnerability, uniqueness and connection, and deeply relate in intimate ways with our closest loved ones? How frequently do we enjoy the company of friends and neighbors and the joy of fellowship and good food shared at a communal table? Are we able to easily name three to four close friends or family members that we know will have our backs when times get tough? How regularly do we—along with the neighbors in our broader communities—feel the satisfaction of meaningful work done well? Can we survey the communities in our state and know that they *all* have equal access to nutritious food, clean water and air, good education, and the access to the natural world that is essential to the flourishing of human life? Are we and our neighbors regularly able to access, appreciate and be inspired by the aesthetic beauty and value reflected in both human-created art and in our interactions with non-human beings? Can we voice our complaints and convictions, and know that we have the power to change what ails us individually and communally? Are affirmative answers to the questions above not the very definition of what it means to be human, whole, and to flourish individually and communally? I certainly cannot speak for everyone in the United States, but the

characteristics inferred by affirmative answers to such questions are not those that I witness regularly in our broader culture and I do not seem to be alone in that assessment.

In 1951, Paul Tillich described the human condition as one of “disruption, conflict, self-destruction, meaninglessness, and despair in all realms of life.”<sup>1</sup> Somewhat more recently, Jürgen Moltmann linked this inner state of “alienation of the human being from [his or her] bodily existence” to the “external ecological crisis of modern industrial society.”<sup>2</sup> In fact, in *God in Creation*, Moltmann describes the current environmental state as not just a crisis for the earth, but as “nothing less than a crisis in human beings themselves.”<sup>3</sup> James W. Heisig points out that the “wanton destruction of the environment” as well as “the unbalanced infatuation with professionalism and expertise, the repression of aesthetic values by scientific materialism, and the failure to appreciate that the ethical neutrality of technological power throws the ethical responsibility back on society” were all attributed by mathematician-philosopher Alfred North Whitehead to the modern human’s non-relationally-aware and ratio-centric ego—or “self-defeating particularity.”<sup>4</sup>

Modernity’s “heroic ego,” champion of numerous achievements of which humankind can be proud, has been a “mixed blessing,” notes Jungian analyst and seminary professor Robert L. Moore (as has been argued for decades by Catherine Keller and many other feminist scholars and theologians) because the down side of the consciousness and autonomy it engendered have been “alienation from the physical world, from the body, and from the unconscious.” This ego is inflated, unrooted, and denies its limitations along with its “embeddedness in the physical and

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume I* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973), 39.

<sup>2</sup> Jürgen Moltmann, *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993), 48.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, xiii.

<sup>4</sup> James W. Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 175.



social world”<sup>5</sup> from which it was born and on which it depends. According to archetypal philosopher Richard Tarnas, the evolutionary processes that have allowed a “centered” and “autonomous” human self to emerge have simultaneously moved our cultural, religious, philosophical, and scientific outlooks to an overall worldview that has served to “gradually empty the external world of all intrinsic meaning and purpose,” removing from the world “all those qualities with which the human being is uniquely identified.”<sup>6</sup> He continues,

In effect, to sum up a very complex process, the achievement of human autonomy has been paid for by the experience of human alienation. How precious the former, how painful the latter. What may be viewed as the fundamental epistemological strategy of the evolving human mind—the systematic separation of subject from object—one carried forth to its fullest extent by the modern mind, has proved to be powerfully effective and indeed liberating. Yet many of that strategy’s long-term consequences have also proved to be highly problematic.<sup>7</sup>

Progress itself may indeed be partially responsible for creating the very polarity with which we wrestle and within which we suffer, anxious and lonely. Here, at the “end of the Christian era,” we are the beneficiaries of astonishing human advances on the scientific and technological fronts, yet it seems that our very progress has left us “cut off from our instinctual roots.”<sup>8</sup> Long before the 2016 election season, clinical psychologist and professor of Jungian studies Robin Robertson claimed that “The late 20th century is a time when the tension has reached a breaking point.”

We have seen the twin poles of spirit and instinct pull people in first one direction, then in the other. Over the last 35 years, for example, the sexual revolution argued for the primacy of instinct, the ‘born again’ movement the primacy of spirit; liberals argued for our social responsibility to others, conservatives for the need to take responsibility for oneself. Back and forth the

---

<sup>5</sup> Robert L. Moore, “Psychocosmetics: A Jungian Response,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 157.

<sup>6</sup> Richard Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche: Intimations of a New World View* (New York: Viking Adult, 2006), 24–25.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>8</sup> Robin Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes: Jung, Gödel, and the History of Archetypes*, Revised (New York: iUniverse, 2009), 248.

pendulum has swung, carrying people in its wake. But neither side of the pendulum's swing can contain a final answer.<sup>9</sup>

We have made astonishing progress as a culture. We can point to countless examples of inventions and advancements that have been made that have ended misery, improved public health, and left us speechless with their aesthetic beauty. Yet we still seem to relentlessly be at war with ourselves, with each other, and with the planet. There are numerous symptoms to which we can point, and in this chapter, I will highlight the ways in which we are divided as people, living within a divisive culture, and sketch out the wholeness that may help us flourish individually and communally.

## **A DIVIDED PEOPLE**

We do not have to look very far for the evidential tracings of the kind of division and alienation that Tillich, Moltmann, Tarnas, and Robertson have described. As will be shown in this chapter, we are divided *societally*, as evidenced in our political polarization and the rise of hate groups. We are divided *interpersonally* as evidenced in increasing loneliness and isolation. Finally, we are divided *intrapersonally*, as is evidenced by the exploding usage of antidepressants and the correlation between early adverse childhood experience and morbidity, mortality, and disability that is somehow related to the divided psyches that result from trauma.

### **Ideological and Societal Fragmentation**

At the time of this writing, the United States has just completed a presidential election season that has only deepened our already chasmic political polarization. In 2014, the Pew Research Center reported that “Republicans and Democrats are more divided along ideological

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 150.

lines—and partisan antipathy is deeper and more extensive—than at any point in the last two decades.”<sup>10</sup> Some of the statistics highlighted include:

- The overall share of Americans who express consistently conservative or consistently liberal opinions has doubled over the past two decades from 10% to 21%;
- 92% of Republicans are to the right of the median Democrat, and 94% of Democrats are to the left of the median Republican;
- Partisan antipathy has grown to where 27% of Democrats view the Republican Party as a threat to national wellbeing and 36% of Republicans view the Democratic Party in the same way.<sup>11</sup>

Another indicator of expanding societal fissures is described by Mark Potok, senior fellow at the Southern Poverty Law Center, who reports that the number of hate groups in the United States rose 14%, as did the number of “conspiracy-minded” antigovernment “Patriot” groups. Recent years have brought us extremist violence in the form of terror plots, the slaughter of African-American churchgoers during a prayer meeting, and the bombing or burning of numerous mosques. In fact, more people were killed by extremist groups in the United States in 2015 than in any year since 1995’s Oklahoma City bombing.<sup>12</sup> Yet an alarming body count is just the tip of the iceberg. According to Potok, “Violence motivated by racial, ethnic or religious animus fractures society along its most fragile fault lines, and sends shock waves through entire

---

<sup>10</sup> 1615 L. The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, “Political Polarization in the American Public” (Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, June 12, 2014), <http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/>.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Mark Potok, “The Year in Hate and Extremism,” *Southern Poverty Law Center*, February 11, 2016, <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2016/year-hate-and-extremism>.

targeted communities. More hatred and fear, particularly of diversity, are often the response.”<sup>13</sup>

Fractured communities and the anxiety that results have been harnessed by unscrupulous political candidates who attempt to capitalize on America’s fears. Whereas such extreme hate appeared in the past to be mostly on the fringes of American political life, in this election it has claimed a front and center position.

When it comes to mainstream politics, the hardcore radical right typically says a pox on both their houses. Not this time. Donald Trump’s demonizing statements about Latinos and Muslims have electrified the radical right, leading to glowing endorsements from white nationalist leaders such as Jared Taylor and former Klansman David Duke. White supremacist forums are awash with electoral joy, having dubbed Trump their “Glorious Leader.” And Trump has repaid the compliments, retweeting hate posts and spreading their false statistics on black-on-white crime.<sup>14</sup>

### **Interpersonal Fragmentation**

Unsurprisingly, the division and alienation at the societal level is manifest in our closest relationships as well. Reporting on a General Social Survey conducted by the National Science Foundation in 2014, Janice Shaw Crouse alerts us to the fact that “unprecedented numbers of Americans are lonely.” More than one quarter of the 1,500 interviewed by the investigators “said that they have no one with whom they can talk about their personal troubles or triumphs.”<sup>15</sup> Moreover, when family members are excluded, *more than half* affirmed that statement. What are the consequences of such loneliness and self-perceived social isolation? According to John Cacioppo, a neuroscientist at the University of Chicago, chronic loneliness can cause depression, affect prevalence toward chronic diseases like diabetes, and is even correlated to an increase in

---

<sup>13</sup> Mark Potok, “The Year in Hate and Extremism,” *Southern Poverty Law Center*, February 11, 2016, <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2016/year-hate-and-extremism>.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>15</sup> Janice Shaw Crouse, “The Loneliness of American Society,” *The American Spectator*, May 18, 2014, [http://spectator.org/59230\\_loneliness-american-society/](http://spectator.org/59230_loneliness-american-society/).

likelihood of dementia.<sup>16</sup> Though loneliness can serve a protective purpose, it can also become a negative physiological trigger.

It's also very much like our stress system...Our stress response contributed to survival across human history, but in contemporary society, chronic stress also contributes to morbidity and mortality...Partly, we're showing that the brain is organized in part to deal with and to promote salutary connections to other people. The fundamental question was 'what is the social nature of our brain?' One of the things that surprised me was how important loneliness proved to be. It predicted morbidity. It predicted mortality. And that shocked me. When we experimentally manipulated loneliness, we found surprising changes in the 'personalities' of people. There's a lot more power to the perception of being socially isolated than any of us had thought.<sup>17</sup>

### **Intrapersonal Fragmentation**

Americans are suffering socially *and* psychosomatically. Citing a report from the National Center for Health Statistics, Peter Wehrwein notes that "the rate of antidepressant use in this country among teens and adults (people ages 12 and older) increased by almost 400% between 1988–1994 and 2005–2008."<sup>18</sup> The report also stated that:

- 23% of women in their 40s and 50s take antidepressants, a higher percentage than any other group (by age or sex);
- Women are two and one half times more likely to be taking an antidepressant than men;
- 14% of non-Hispanic white people take antidepressants compared with just 4% of non-Hispanic blacks and 3% of Mexican Americans
- Less than a third of Americans who are taking a single type of antidepressant (as opposed to two or more) have seen a mental health professional in the past year.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> "The Profound Power of Loneliness: National Science Foundation," *National Science Foundation*, February 3, 2016, [http://www.nsf.gov/discoveries/disc\\_summ.jsp?cntn\\_id=137534](http://www.nsf.gov/discoveries/disc_summ.jsp?cntn_id=137534).

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Peter Wehrwein, "Astounding Increase in Antidepressant Use by Americans," *Harvard Health Blog*, October 20, 2011, <http://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/astounding-increase-in-antidepressant-use-by-americans-201110203624>.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid.

The symptoms of our cultural dis-ease go beyond the increasing usage of psycho-pharmaceuticals. In 1998, physician-researchers Vincent J. Felitti and Robert F. Anda released the findings of a collaborative study between Kaiser Permanente's Department of Preventive Medicine in San Diego (Felitti) and the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC, Anda). Known as the ACEs study, their research was conducted to examine the relationship between "traumatic stress in childhood and the leading causes of morbidity, mortality, and disability in the United States: cardiovascular disease, chronic lung disease, chronic liver disease, depression and other forms of mental illness, obesity, smoking, and alcohol and drug abuse." A major epidemiological study of 17,000 participants, the ACEs research analyzed "the effect of traumatic experiences during the first eighteen years of life on adolescent and adult medical and psychiatric disease, sexual behavior, healthcare costs, and life expectancy."<sup>20</sup> The findings were stunning.

It became evident that traumatic life experiences during childhood and adolescence were far more common than generally recognized, were complexly interrelated, and were associated decades later in a strong and proportionate manner with outcomes important to medical practice, public health, and the social fabric of the nation. In the context of everyday medical practice, we came to recognize that the earliest years of infancy and childhood are not lost but, like a child's footprints in wet cement, are often life-long.<sup>21</sup>

In two waves of research, ten categories of adverse childhood experience were ultimately identified that included physical/emotional/sexual abuse, having an alcoholic or drug abuser in the household, physical/emotional neglect, and divorce or an incarcerated parent. Based on their responses, everyone was given an ACE score that represented the numerical total of each

---

<sup>20</sup> Vincent J. Felitti and Robert F. Anda, "The Relationship of Adverse Childhood Experiences to Adult Medical Disease, Psychiatric Disorders and Sexual Behavior: Implications for Healthcare," in *The Impact of Early Life Trauma on Health and Disease: The Hidden Epidemic*, ed. Ruth A. Lanius, Eric Vermetten, and Clare Pain (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 78–79.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

category experienced. Of these 17,000 middle-class Americans with high-quality health insurance, it was determined that only one third had an ACE score of 0, “[o]ne in six individuals had an ACE score of 4 or more, and one in nine had an ACE score of 5 or more.” Moreover, “Women were 50% more likely than men to have experienced five or more categories of adverse childhood experiences.”<sup>22</sup>

How can such early experience affect our physical health and behavior? Jungian analyst Donald Kalsched’s work is helpful here. He shows that although trauma can happen at any age, it is particularly difficult in early childhood “where, because of the immaturity of the psyche and/or brain, we are ill-equipped to metabolize our experience.”<sup>23</sup> For young children, trauma is not just a bad memory—it threatens to shatter their very “psycho-somatic unity.” While the kind of complete shattering that might destroy the developing personality “almost never happens,” what can happen instead, Kalsched asserts, is *dissociation*.

Dissociation seals over non-being. It prevents annihilation of the unit self, substituting multiplicity and an archetypal story that implicitly holds the parts together. The unbearable affect is distributed to different parts of the psyche/soma. These parts cease to know about each other so that the personality does not have to suffer the unspeakable horror of trauma *as a whole*...<sup>24</sup>

In order to protect us from the full impact of experience that is unbearable, different aspects of the traumatic experience (sensation, affect, image) are fragmented, divided into compartments, and encoded in segmented ‘neural nets’ in the brain. In this way they are prevented from joining up into a meaningful whole. After this we no longer make sense to ourselves. We can’t tell our own story as a coherent narrative.<sup>25</sup>

In other words, energies and affect unbearable as a whole are distributed and held in a dissociated way in the psyche and body, where the emotional pain and discomfort are not felt

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 79–80.

<sup>23</sup> Donald Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul: A Psycho-Spiritual Approach to Human Development and Its Interruption* (London, New York: Routledge, 2013), 10.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 23.

consciously but often dealt with unconsciously through self-medication and self-soothing behaviors. The effects of such dissociation are borne out by the ACEs study, wherein high ACEs scores were directly correlated with higher incidences of a wide range of risky behaviors and public health ills including: alcoholism, alcohol abuse, smoking, and illicit drug use; depression and suicide attempts; chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, ischemic heart disease, and liver disease; financial stress and impaired worker performance; and higher risk for intimate partner violence and sexual violence overall.<sup>26</sup> One sixth of the study population had an ACE score of 4 or more and, at those levels, their incidences of such risks were exponentially higher than for those with scores of even 1 or 2. Extrapolated to the total population of the United States—currently over 324 million<sup>27</sup>—we can estimate that over 54 million Americans have an ACE score of 4 or more. It is no wonder that Robert W. Block, former president of the American Academy of Pediatrics claims that “Adverse childhood experiences are the single greatest unaddressed public health threat facing our nation today.”<sup>28</sup> Felitti and Anda conclude:

The influence of childhood experience, including often-unrecognized traumatic events, is as powerful as [Sigmund] Freud and his colleagues originally described it to be. These influences are long-lasting, and neuroscientists are now describing the intermediary mechanisms that develop as a result of these stressors. Unfortunately, and in spite of these findings, the biopsychosocial model and the bio-medical model of psychiatry remain at odds rather than taking advantage of these new discoveries to reinforce each other.<sup>29</sup>

Pointed examples in this section highlight the fragmentation in American culture at the societal, interpersonal, and intrapersonal levels, all of which result in the societal ills reflected in political polarization, hate groups, loneliness, isolation, rising antidepressant usage, and costly

---

<sup>26</sup> Felitti and Anda, “The Relationship of Adverse Childhood Experiences,” 78.

<sup>27</sup> “Population Clock” (United States Census Bureau), accessed September 17, 2016, <http://www.census.gov/popclock/>.

<sup>28</sup> “Adverse Childhood Experience Study (ACES),” *Advokids: A Legal Resource for California Foster Children and Their Advocates*, accessed September 16, 2016, <http://www.advokids.org/adverse-childhood-experience-study-aces/>.

<sup>29</sup> Felitti and Anda, “The Relationship of Adverse Childhood Experiences,” 86.



and debilitating effects of adverse childhood experience. In the next section, I will show how the roots of such fragmentation lie in the very culture and worldview within which we are embedded.

## **A DIVISIVE CULTURE**

Rarely, if ever, do we as individuals even consciously think about our “worldview.” A worldview is the water within which we swim and the unconscious backdrop to our language, our decisions, our assertions, and our beliefs about the world and other beings. It is the invisible frame upon which our cultural experience is draped, yet it also directly forms those very experiences. Although this is far from an exegesis of the entirety of Western culture and its influences, there are key elements upon which our culture is based that seem to be entrenched, yet their assumptions are hardly even noticed, let alone examined. The elements with which we are primarily concerned herein are mind-body *dualism* and its handmaidens, *mechanism* and dismissal of the *nonrational*.

### **Dualism**

When Block bemoans the fact that the bio-psycho-social model and the bio-medical model are “at odds,” he may not even be consciously aware that they are “at odds” because psyche and matter—or mind and body—have been at odds in the Western paradigm since the Enlightenment. In other words, as long as there is no scientifically accepted and meaningful description of how mind and body interact—as is generally the case in the Western mechanistic and dualistic views—we will continue to act in “self-defeating particularity” and contrary to the realities of our embodied and embedded lives. Until that split is healed and we can experience embodied human life as something other than one of alienation, isolation, and despair, we will

see no respite from the disastrous consequences of such bifurcation in our relationships to our bodies, to each other, and to the very ecosystems on which our lives depend.

In this regard, medicine and the natural sciences have been slow to recognize what humanities scholars have argued for decades. Process theologians John B. Cobb, Jr. and David Ray Griffin have linked our modern sense of alienation or estrangement from embodied life with “the dualistic view that human beings are totally different in kind from the rest of the world.”<sup>30</sup> Murray Stein, a training Jungian analyst at the International School for Analytical Psychology in Zurich, Switzerland, concurs with this description of the human condition when he writes that “with the passing of active tribalism, there has come the modern experience of anomie and lack of kinship with the universe.”<sup>31</sup> Episcopal priest and Jungian analyst Morton T. Kelsey relates all of this to Jung’s belief that the “situation of modern [humans]” was one in which they are “almost too aware” of the physical world, and “almost entirely unconscious” of the nonphysical world because “nineteenth century materialism deprived man of the ability to consider the nonphysical, and so what goes on in this world is often negative to him.”<sup>32</sup>

### **Dismissal of the Nonrational**

If the *nonphysical* is not considered, the *nonrational* is actively dismissed. Yet both Freud and Jung understood all humans to have a *nonrational* unconscious that is dynamic in nature, and they appreciated its powerful impact on human experience and perception through its irruptive breaks into conscious awareness. For both men, the unconscious gives humans access

---

<sup>30</sup> John B. Cobb Jr. and David Ray Griffin, *Process Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1976), 18.

<sup>31</sup> Murray Stein, “Jung’s Green Christ,” in *Jung’s Challenge to Contemporary Religion*, ed. Murray Stein and Robert L. Moore (Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1987), 6.

<sup>32</sup> Morton T. Kelsey, *Encounter With God: A Theology of Christian Experience* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 38–39.

to the eternal flow of life and energy that fuels all living beings. Freud referred to this flow as ‘primary-process’ thinking while Jung used the term ‘nondirected’ thinking. For both Freud and Jung, such contact with primordial human experience—the most basic strata of human experience and instinct—carried enormous power and emotional punch.

### **Nondirected Thinking and Religion**

The flow of what Jung called ‘nondirected thinking’ was not just about sex or death, as it was with Freud, but about life, creativity, generativity, expression, and the desire of this unconscious flow of life to be differentiated into actualized reality. Jung was certain that our deepest unconscious reality seeks integration and speaks through the language of symbols to draw people toward an individuated state of wholeness wherein the opposing forces of the psyche are integrated and unconscious shadow materials and the energy they hold can be utilized and released for expressive purposes.

Unlike Freud, who thought religion was infantile and destructive, Jung believed religion to be inextricably and vitally bound up with humanness and a ‘necessary fact’ in human experience. He understood the encounter with primordial experience to be like what religion understands to be the ‘original mystery’ typically referred to as ‘God.’ He also asserted that none of his second-half-of-life patients had been healed without regaining a “religious outlook.”<sup>33</sup> Jung elaborated on that statement in a letter wherein he explained that people “since times immemorial” had always held some kind of view of the wholeness of the world that then facilitated the wholeness of the individual person within that frame. Movement toward individual wholeness, he insisted, was an “instinctual activity,” a *drive* of the mind that requires an *object* in

---

<sup>33</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 169.

order to be satisfied, in the same way that hunger requires food. Therefore, when people lose a religious frame of reference, they are no longer “rooted in their world” and “the need for a meaning of their lives remains unanswered because the rational, biological goals are unable to express the irrational wholeness of human life.”<sup>34</sup>

Experiences of the numinous or transcendent have historically been facilitated through the structures of religion. Until relatively recently, direct experience of that “transcendent, numinous mode of being,” that engagement with deep unconscious forces, was facilitated by “creative” and “intuitive” modes of being such as “religious belief and spiritual practice, ritual and dance, artwork and poetry, romance and relationship, music and dreams” and any other mode of activity that is “open to the nonrational side of experience.”<sup>35</sup> In *Teaching Jung*, David Tacey notes that

The increasingly rational nature of modern life has had a destructive impact on our traditional forms of transcendence. Typically, the modern person has little or no access to religion or spirituality, to ritual or poetry, and even romance and relationship have become attenuated, commercialized, and clichéd. Many of our nonrational outlets and avenues have been blocked, devalued, or destroyed.<sup>36</sup>

It is the *lack of the experience of this kind of wholeness*—rootedness in our world and a sense of meaning that goes beyond our individual experience—that our societal fragmentation reveals.

Yet that kind of encounter with a sacred reality is unfathomable for most modern people for two main reasons: 1) we are generally unaware of a way to understand a religious reality that is neither *supernatural* nor merely *subjective*; and, 2) if such a religious reality exists, we are generally unaware of a way to access it in our ordinary, day-to-day lives. To understand where we may go from here, it is necessary to briefly examine religion’s function regarding the depths

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 169–70.

<sup>35</sup> David Tacey, “The Challenge of Teaching Jung in the University,” in *Teaching Jung*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, AAR Teaching Religious Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 15.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

of human experience as well as its role in connecting individuals to what is transpersonal and whole.

### *Primordial Experience and Transpersonal Reality*

Ann and Barry Ulanov understand religion to be a “true container” for primordial experience that serves: 1) to protect the individual from being overwhelmed and swept away by their encounter with the numinous or primordial and thereby safeguard human sanity; and, 2) to protect individual autonomy and freedom by giving the individual an extra-mundane authority and point of reference, so that one does not fall under the spell of “mass mindedness,” or be in lock-step with the collective. Yet Edward F. Edinger would also warn us that though collective religion may serve a protective role regarding the powerful depths of the unconscious, it may also rob us of the “individual experience of these depths and the possibility of development which such experience promotes,” leaving us without an “individual relation to the transpersonal dimension.”<sup>37</sup> “All religious practices,” writes Edinger, “hold up to view the transpersonal categories of existence and attempt to relate them to the individual.”<sup>38</sup>

Those “transpersonal” or “suprapersonal” categories are articulated via a culture’s myths and sacred stories, and are typically present in that society’s collective rituals of life. The religious practices embodied in those collective rituals serve as “the best collective protection available against both [ego] inflation and alienation,”<sup>39</sup> because they offer the individual a “moral orientation and meaning for life.”<sup>40</sup> But contemporary Western culture is marked by the

---

<sup>37</sup> Edward F. Edinger, *Ego and Archetype: Individuation and the Religious Function of the Psyche* (Boston; London: Shambhala, 1992), 64.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 64.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> Gerald H. Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” in *Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 87.

collapse of myth and symbol and its replacement with a “nineteenth-century myth of scientific materialism” that “pretends to be not myth but sober fact.”<sup>41</sup> Yet Gerald R. Slusser argues that life “cannot properly proceed” without myth and symbol because “mythic statements...frame a view of the world which adequately explains the meaning of psychic wholeness...Meaninglessness inhibits fullness of life and is therefore equivalent to illness.”<sup>42</sup> Edinger, too, doubts that collective human life can survive for very long without a shared system of transpersonal categories, or myth and symbol.<sup>43</sup> “The fact is,” he writes,

that large numbers of individuals do not have living, functioning suprapersonal categories by which they can understand life experience, supplied either by the church or otherwise. This is a dangerous state of affairs because, when such categories do not exist, the ego is likely to think of itself as everything or as nothing.<sup>44</sup>

### *Projection and Inflation*

The elimination of a transpersonal target for projection does not eliminate the need to project; projection just moves from being transpersonal to being personal. Without a transpersonal place toward which to point the powerful, unconscious energies of life, humans will either project them onto other human beings<sup>45</sup>—seeing their new flame, for example, as a “god” or “goddess”—or on “banal or secular matters” such as “personal power” a “social reform movement,” or any number of “-isms”; when this happens, “personal, secular, or political actions become charged with unconscious religious meaning.” Such a move is “dangerous because whenever a religious motivation is acting unconsciously it causes fanaticism with all its

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 64.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 64.

<sup>45</sup> Robert A. Segal, “Jung on Myth,” in *Teaching Jung*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, AAR Teaching Religious Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 86.

destructive consequences.”<sup>46</sup> On the other hand, when collective life is stable and individuals share “a common living myth or deity,” people are capable of projecting their inner God-image (what Jung called the Self) onto the communal religion and that religion then “serves as the container for the Self for a multitude of individuals.” The common religion then functions to inhibit “widespread inflation or alienation.”<sup>47</sup>

If now the outer church loses its capacity to carry the projection of the Self, we have the condition which Nietzsche announced for the modern world, ‘God is dead!’ All the psychic energy and values that had been contained in the church now flow back to the individual, activating [his or her] psyche and causing serious problems.<sup>48</sup>

The “serious problems” Edinger identifies that result from the loss of religious projection include 1) individuals losing their inner connection to the Self/divine, resulting in alienation and a sense of life’s meaninglessness; 2) individuals assuming the divine energies, resulting in a sense of inflation, such as is seen “in the hubris that overvalues [human] rational and manipulative powers and denies the sacred mystery inherent in life and nature”; 3) individuals may project religious energies onto secular or political movements, as noted above; or 4) individuals may be “thrown back on [themselves]” and forced to “confront the ultimate questions of life that are posed for [them]”; in so doing, individuals may discover the “lost value, the god-image” within themselves, at which point the loss of religious projection will have served a “salutary purpose” to foster “the development of an individuated personality.”<sup>49</sup> The very birth of depth psychology Edinger describes as a “symptom of our time” in that its emergence has been initiated by the loss of religious projection and the breakdown of a collective “traditional symbol

---

<sup>46</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 64–65.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 65.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 67–68.

system.” The crumbling of those structures created a “great surge of energy” flowing back toward the individual psyche with increased focus, then, on individual subjectivity. He writes,

In plays and novels the most banal and commonplace individuals are described exhaustively in their most petty and personal aspects. A degree of value and attention is being given to inner subjectivity that never before happened. Actually this tendency is a point toward things to come. If it is pursued to its inevitable conclusion, it cannot help but lead more and more people to a rediscovery of the lost suprapersonal categories within themselves.<sup>50</sup>

Inflation of the individual is diametrically opposed to any kind of community or sense of unity within a society. The kind of relational “communion”—or what Victor Turner calls *communitas*—has typically been wrought through collective ritual experience. Turner’s work in cultural anthropology as described by Kelly Bulkeley, a scholar working at the intersection of psychology, religion, and cognitive science, reveals the way rituals *change* people and the way they participate in the “structures imposed by social convention that govern ordinary life.” Rituals use symbols and “liminal” space to move individuals “from one condition” or stage of life to another and, more importantly, create an experience—even if only temporary—of society “as an *unstructured, undifferentiated* community of equals bound together by an essential unity.” Having experienced that essential unity and relatedness, members of a community are then able to “participate most fully and most creatively in the hierarchical structures inevitable in any social group.”<sup>51</sup> Yet where can contemporary Americans go to experience our “essential unity” today? The answer to that question does not currently seem to be “to church.”

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid., 68–69.

<sup>51</sup> Kelly Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night: Dreams, Religion and Psychology* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), 44–45.



## *Religion and the Church*

What is the state of traditional religion in the United States today? According to Pew Research's Religion and Public Life Project, "One-fifth of the U.S. public—and a third of adults under 30—are religiously unaffiliated today, the highest percentages ever in Pew Research Center polling." This group includes atheists, agnostics, and people who say they "have no particular religious affiliation (14%)." At the same time, 46 million unaffiliated adults identify as religious or spiritual due to belief in God, a connection with nature, or a practice of prayer. More than a third classify themselves as "spiritual" but not "religious."<sup>52</sup> Judging by the numbers, it does not appear that traditional approaches to religious symbols are working to function as a unifying, collective container for the transpersonal in contemporary American society.

Have theologians and church leaders responded to our spiritual crises in ways that are helpful? Not necessarily. Though in the early Church "there was much emphasis upon being led by the Spirit," an idea central to New Testament writings according to Griffin, not long after its formation, the Church began to stress this aspect of faith less and less.

A Christian was increasingly defined in terms of certain doctrinal beliefs, and these were beliefs that did not concern the relation of God's Spirit to the actual experiences of daily life. Rather, they were beliefs about what God had done in the past, and what [God] would do in the future. The sense of a present experience of God that characterized Jesus and the early Church was largely gone. And, except for a few ecstatic movements, this situation has characterized the Church down to the present.<sup>53</sup>

Griffin attributes this in part to the fact that Christian theologians did not construct a "genuinely Christian account of God's mode of acting upon the world in general, and human experience in

---

<sup>52</sup> The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life, "'Nones' on the Rise" (Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, October 9, 2012), <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>.

<sup>53</sup> David Ray Griffin, "Holy Spirit: Compassion and Reverence for Being," in *Religious Experience and Process Theology*, ed. Bernard Cargas and Harry J. Lee (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 109.

particular.”<sup>54</sup> Cobb concurs that churches are failing to meet the religious needs of people because of “our general theological failure.”<sup>55</sup> While Griffin thinks most of the “beliefs about the past have lost their hold,”<sup>56</sup> Jung attributes this truth to modern humans’ “ineradicable aversion for traditional opinions and inherited truths.” For them, science and religion cannot be reconciled because “Christian tenets have lost their authority and psychological justification.”<sup>57</sup> According to Jung,

Traditional religious symbols no longer mediate the transcendent factors they once did; they are no longer alive. The modern person reveals an empty space at the center, which was formerly occupied by a God image... We no longer know how to imagine God, nor does the modern (i.e., rational, instrumental, ego-centered) person have the means to begin the process of re-imagining and re-perceiving God.<sup>58</sup>

Though shocking at the time, Cobb thinks the “death-of-God theologians” were stating something truthful because what most Christians meant when they spoke of God had become empty of “conviction and reality.”<sup>59</sup> What has taken the place of faith, for many, is a psychology of experience; a symptom, for Jung, “of a profound convulsion of spiritual life.”<sup>60</sup>

In his blog “Is Biblicist Christianity Bankrupt?,” Michael Dowd stakes his claim that Christians must embrace scientific evidence and rejects “the notion

that our best map of reality and most helpful signposts for living are to be found in ancient, mythic tales that were passed on orally for generations before being written down. I reject the idea that God’s most vital and dependable guidance would have come in the distant past rather than the present... Ours is a time of space telescopes, electron microscopes, supercomputers, and the worldwide web. It is also a time of smart bombs, collapsing economies, and exploding oil

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> John B. Cobb Jr., “Spiritual Discernment in a Whiteheadian Perspective,” in *Religious Experience and Process Theology: The Pastoral Implications of a Major Modern Movement*, ed. Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 350.

<sup>56</sup> Griffin, “Holy Spirit: Compassion and Reverence for Being,” 110.

<sup>57</sup> C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Harvest, 1955), 232.

<sup>58</sup> Stein, “Jung’s Green Christ,” 3.

<sup>59</sup> Cobb Jr., “Spiritual Discernment in a Whiteheadian Perspective,” 351.

<sup>60</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 202.

platforms. This is not a time for parsing the lessons given to a few goatherds, tentmakers, and camel drivers.<sup>61</sup>

He writes that honoring “historical, scientific, and cross-cultural evidence” is to honor “the authority of scripture,” and unless we do this, the Church will “continue its slide into irrelevance or extinction.”<sup>62</sup> Though embracing scientific evidence would certainly be a step forward, much in human experience cannot be so neatly categorized. Jung believed that our task is to “rediscover the life of the spirit; we must experience it anew for ourselves...it is easy enough to drive the spirit out the door, but when we have done so the salt of life grows flat—it loses its savor.”<sup>63</sup>

In this section, I have shown the negative effects of a culture and worldview that is based in dualistic and mechanistic thinking that rejects what is nonrational. Such a dismissive stance robs us of appreciation for, and access to, the deep primordial experience that is the source of life and vitality as well as the ability derive creative responses to life that our nondirected thinking engenders. We have traded our targets for transpersonal projection for the burdensome weight on the individual person of that which used to be held by transpersonal categories and values, resulting in ego inflation and ideological devotion to any number of “isms.” And many have turned their backs on what they perceive to be an irrelevant Church with walking dead symbols that can no longer serve as a collective site of ritual experience and unity. As a result, we have no shared values upon which we can rest, and that might smooth our relations with the “others” to whom we are regularly exposed and of whom we are naturally wary or even fearful until we get

---

<sup>61</sup> Michael Dowd, “Is Biblicist Christianity Bankrupt?,” *Evolutionary Christianity*, n.d., <http://evolutionarychristianity.com/blog/general/is-biblicist-christianity-bankrupt/>.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid.

<sup>63</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 122–23.

to know them. The dividedness we experience and the problems it engenders are not individually created; they are a paradigmatic problem.

### **A Paradigmatic Problem**

In our current era, Tarnas describes three fundamental factors at play in the “Western” context. The first is a “profound metaphysical disorientation and groundlessness that pervades contemporary human experience” that is marked by the absence of any kind of overarching purposes, meaning, or metanarrative that could “give to collective human existence a nourishing coherence and intelligibility.” The second factor is the “deep sense of alienation that affects the modern self” at the levels of the personal isolation perceived by many in our industrial, information-soaked-but-imagination-thirsty society, the “spiritual estrangement of the modern psyche in a disenchanted universe,” as well as the bifurcation between humans and the natural cosmos. Finally, Tarnas points to the “critical need...for a deeper insight into those unconscious forces and tendencies, creative and destructive, that play such a powerful role in shaping human lives, history, and the life of the planet.”<sup>64</sup>

If we draw our lens back to take in the widest frame, we see that all the forces described in the sections above have led us to a state where the planet we depend on for our very life and breath is now on the verge of ecological collapse. Though evidence of climate change relentlessly mounts, the United States is politically frozen, impotent regarding any of the steps that might help. Species are becoming extinct in record numbers, toxic wastes have polluted both watersheds and low-income communities, transnational corporations pillage economically poor countries for their precious resources, populations grow exponentially beyond what the Earth can

---

<sup>64</sup> Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, xiv.

support, and still, Americans are “gonna party like it’s 1999,”<sup>65</sup> consuming ever more, every year. Yet, rather than despairing at this moment of “climactic urgency,” Tarnas strikes a hopeful note, suggesting that we are poised at “an extraordinary threshold” that could bring about “a genuinely fundamental transformation in the underlying assumptions and principles of the cultural world view.”<sup>66</sup>

Amidst our multitudes of debates and controversies that fill the intellectual arena, our basic understanding of reality is in contention: the role of the human being in nature and the cosmos, the status of human knowledge, the basis of moral values, the dilemmas of pluralism, relativism, objectivity, the spiritual dimension of life, the direction and meaning—if any—of history and evolution...The stakes are high, for the future of humanity and the future of the Earth.<sup>67</sup>

Can we recover an appreciation of the importance of nondirected thinking and the access such thinking gives us to the primordial source of vitality, dynamism, and creativity in human life? I have shown how our culture has lost the necessary function that religion provides in being a container for primordial experience, and by providing targets for transpersonal projection and ritual. We have seen how the loss of ritual and transpersonal projection result in psychological ego inflation and diminished communal bonding. Finally, we have begun to see the devastating effects that a faulty paradigm can have on us as individuals, on our society, and on planetary health. We have reached a moment of crucial decision where our very survival hangs in the balance. In such a high-stakes moment, when the outcome is uncertain, the anxiety so great, and the potential birth pangs so convulsive, we need an alluring alternative, a vision of wholeness toward which we can be drawn.

---

<sup>65</sup> Prince, "1999," LP, vol. 9 23720-1, 1999 (Jacksonville, FL: WEA, 1982).

<sup>66</sup> Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, xiii.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

## The Wholeness We Need

Certainly, there are existing alternative systems of thought that offer a wealth of resources to undergird such a holistic worldview. Works ranging from theologian Sallie McFague's *Body of God* to numerous voicings of deep ecology principles to historian of religions Mary Evelyn Tucker's and ecological philosopher Brian Swimme's cinematic *Journey of the Universe* have reached into the scientific story of the creation of the cosmos as a unifying vision. A torrent of scientists have—along with Al Gore's *An Inconvenient Truth*—sounded the alarm about the need for a unified response to the global ecological crisis. Other theologians have stressed *panentheism*<sup>68</sup> as a compelling framework within which to understand both vertical and horizontal relationships between God, humans and the natural world as deeply related. Yet these disparate resources—that rarely seem to stray beyond the confines of academia's hallowed halls—do not seem to be adequate to the task of real and lasting change.

Through what means might such real and lasting change—*transformation*—occur? In making his case for the transformative power of dreams, Bulkeley points to the work of philosopher Michael E. Zimmerman as key to understanding the entrenched societal fragmentation and life-threatening behavior loops we seem to find ourselves in. In “Quantum Theory, Intrinsic Value, and Panentheism”<sup>69</sup> Zimmerman argues that “an ethical attitude of respect for the natural environment will come ‘only as we move from atomistic, dualistic ego consciousness toward relational, nondualistic consciousness’” and blames our current state on the human penchant for the kind of independent self-determination that sees the world only as

---

<sup>68</sup> Panentheism is the view that all is held within God while God is both immanent in and transcendent to the cosmos as opposed to pantheism which is the view that the cosmos is equivalent to God and God does not transcend it.

<sup>69</sup> Michael E. Zimmerman, “Quantum Theory, Intrinsic Value, and Panentheism,” in *Postmodern Environmental Ethics*, ed. Max Oelschlaeger (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), 277–307.

instrumentally valuable. He “rousingly affirms” quantum physics as a “new metaphysics” that “overcomes Cartesian dualism by positing the essential interrelatedness of all being” (a vision of the world shared by panentheism and ecofeminism) but then despairs that such “inspiring expressions of nondualistic consciousness” are not enough to spur real change in attitudes.<sup>70</sup> Why? Because even such compelling paradigms “[remain] operative only at the cognitive or rational level; the model does not transform dualistic rationality.”<sup>71</sup> In other words, such cognitive insights do not offer us an *experience* of our “membership in the web of all being.”<sup>72</sup> “As a theory,” Zimmerman writes, “panentheism cannot in and of itself bring about nondualistic experience any more than quantum theory can.”<sup>73</sup>

We cannot *think* our way into a new way of being. Cognitive knowledge in and of itself cannot provide the experience of a relational and meaning- and value-filled world that asks us to contribute our own attainment of value back to it. I am convinced that we will solve neither the ecological crisis nor our estrangement from each other and its attendant social ills until we transform our relationship with embodied life itself and rediscover *within it* what is sacred. Like Bulkeley and Zimmerman, I, too, assert that theories of wholeness, whether psychological, physical, or metaphysical are not enough to overcome the crippling societal, interpersonal, and intrapersonal effects of fragmentation; only *an embodied transformational experience of wholeness* holds any hope for shifting human consciousness and behavior.

What is needed now, claims James W. Heisig, is a reformation of popular imagination by “weaving” into that imagination “insights about eternal value flowing through the temporal” because “nothing of lasting value has been done until the popular imagination has been reformed

---

<sup>70</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 39–40.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>73</sup> Zimmerman, “Quantum Theory, Intrinsic Value, and Panentheism,” 296.

and put to work on reforming civilization self-consciously.”<sup>74</sup> Such work, I believe, is inherently *psycho-spiritual* in nature. Connecting the spiritual with the psychological is fundamentally a return to the roots of psychology. Kenneth Pargament notes that psychology’s “founding figures” from William James to G. Stanley Hall “saw no reason to separate spirituality from psychological study and practice,” naturally including mystical phenomena and conversion experiences.<sup>75</sup> Only later, with psychology’s positivistic alignment with the natural sciences did psychology begin to see spirituality in “oversimplified, stereotypical terms” that, in the cases of Freud and Skinner, focused “on the dark side of faith to the exclusion of its other qualities.”<sup>76</sup> Michael Argyle draws similarities between religious life and psychoanalysis noting that in both “people are seeking salvation, trying to solve their problems and find out how to live a better life.”<sup>77</sup> Though Naomi Goldenberg, a leading author in the field of religious studies and gender, has been a very vocal critic of Jung she acknowledges his attitude toward religious systems to be “very helpful” because he “hypothesized that there is a religious process in every human being” and that people would be “more secure” if they could remain connected to their “native religion,” be “guided” by it, and then see its “basic process within.” Those who could not do so satisfactorily were “both cursed and blessed. Cursed because they could not refer to any established text or doctrine to make the way easier. Blessed because their religious creations had the chance of being much more creative.”<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” 200.

<sup>75</sup> Kenneth I. Pargament, *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy: Understanding and Addressing the Sacred* (New York: The Guilford Press, 2011), 7.

<sup>76</sup> *Ibid.*, 8, 12.

<sup>77</sup> Michael Argyle, *Psychology and Religion: An Introduction* (London, New York: Routledge, 2000), 10.

<sup>78</sup> Naomi R. Goldenberg, “Jung After Feminism,” in *Beyond Androcentrism: New Essays on Women and Religion*, ed. Rita M Gross, American Academy of Religion Aids for the Study of Religion (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for the American Academy of Religion, 1977), 54.



Spirituality, according to David B. Perrin, “involve[s] the integration of all aspects of life in a unified whole.

Authentic life refers to living in an overall spirit of goodwill; it refers to a commitment to look critically at oneself and one’s relationships as well as an openness to question objectively and regularly all aspects of living. All this is with a view to deepening self-appreciation as well as self-giving to others.<sup>79</sup>

Such authentic spirituality is understood as something intrinsic to human nature; it includes a capacity for “transcendence” and “self-transcendence”; and it is a “lived reality that is shaped into a way of life.”<sup>80</sup> Yet this “lived reality” seems to be in short supply in the modern world.

Heisig enlists Thomas Berry to show how “classic Western spirituality, which carried both the religious and the scientific-technological thought of this century to their present forms of alienation, is really at odds with how we experience the world,”<sup>81</sup> specifying these four conceptions as problematic:

- (1) The identification of the divine as transcendent to the natural world, so that the natural world becomes less capable of communicating divine presence;
- (2) The establishment of the human as transcendent to the natural world, so that the world is transformed into crass matter, raw material for human consumption;
- (3) The millennial vision of a blessed future accessible to history through technological progress; and
- (4) The stress on salvation dynamics to the neglect of creation dynamics, so that our eyes could be turned away from our abuse of the earth to focus on moral revivalism and dedication to pious causes.<sup>82</sup>

What is called for now, Heisig and Berry suggest, is a “new and functional cosmology” that stresses “differentiation” and the “value of each articulated form of being,” its “subjectivity” or “radiated intelligibility,” a relational “communion” at both the micro and macro levels, and “the experience of a transcendent, numinous mode of being.”<sup>83</sup> Though we may answer

---

<sup>79</sup> Perrin, *Studying Christian Spirituality*, 18.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 18–19.

<sup>81</sup> Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” 172.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*, 173.

Zimmerman by merely facilitating an experience of nondualistic consciousness, such an isolated experience is not a viable solution if it means a loss of the appreciation of embodied multiplicity. The wholeness we seek must still be pushed beyond just psycho-spiritual experience to include the frame or worldview upon which such an experience rests. We require as well a theoretical and empirical framework through which we can rationally appreciate such an experience.

## **SUMMARY**

In this chapter, we have demonstrated the fragmentary nature of human existence in the contemporary United States of America, and have shown this fragmentation to be societal, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. We have explored the devastating consequences of the largely unexamined worldview upon which Western culture is based and have called into question its dualistic and mechanistic mindset as well as its dismissal of what is nonrational. We have shown how the ineffectiveness and widespread irrelevancy of organized religion in general and the Christian Church in particular have led to the loss of transpersonal projection and collective ritual, resulting in rising individual inflation and communal disconnection. Finally, we have argued in this chapter that until contemporary people in the United States experience a real, transformative encounter with a transpersonal Reality that reflects our wholeness and value, our relatedness to everything, and the hope of transformative change, we will continue to be fragmented as individuals and as a society.

In order to move us forward toward the changes we need to make, it is essential that we be able to access and describe such transformative experience through a theoretical and empirical framework that can be appreciated rationally as well as nonrationally. Therefore, I will argue in this work that a framework that generatively synthesizes the process thought of Alfred North Whitehead and the analytical psychology of Carl Gustav Jung—where consciousness,

particularity, and multiplicity are prized alongside integrated wholeness—uniquely presents such embodied transformational experiences as a reunification that maintains diverse and particular value and feeling rather than as merely a regression to a pre-conscious monistic unity. Such a framework, I believe, provides the theoretical and empirical foundation through which such transformative encounters with transpersonal Reality can be facilitated. The next chapter proposes the resources upon which I will draw to construct this framework.

## CHAPTER 2: INTEGRATING RESOURCES

### INTRODUCTION

At its core, this project argues that what is needed now to solve the problem of fragmentation is a generative synthesis of 1) a metaphysical/*theoretical* framework that coheres with 2) an *empirical* psycho-physical framework, both of which are supported by 3) a spiritual *practice* that facilitates transformative lived experience which confirms both frameworks through direct experience. This is the kind of wholeness to which this project points. Here, authentic spirituality is enhanced and deepened by an appreciation of what is psychological to the human—the development of consciousness and insights into one’s unconscious reactions to the slings and arrows of daily life. Even more specifically, it is deepened by a view of reality “as Jung finally came to appreciate it, i.e., as involving a subjectively real, ineffable, mytho-poetic” reality that confronts us with “contents that are collective, pre-personal, and daimonic.”<sup>1</sup>

In this chapter, I will show why the resources of Whitehead’s process thought and Jung’s analytical psychology are necessary and useful in the twenty-first century by first showing what is still compelling and relevant in their thinking, establishing their shared areas of interest, and then describing what I am calling *resonances*. We will then explore areas where Whitehead and Jung are in contrast to one another, such as in their approaches to metaphysical speculation, in what is psychological versus what is ontological, and in *logos* versus *mythos* thinking. While it is not surprising that such creative and adventurous thinkers would be the targets of criticism, some of those critiques may be more valid than others; still, I will look at Whitehead’s critics who

---

<sup>1</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 267.

charge him with using off-putting language, and being elitist and overly optimistic as well as some of Jung's critics who question his archetypal theory, and charge him with Nazism and anti-Semitism, gender essentialism and misogyny, and with supporting the status quo. Finally, I will note the limitations that each of our theoretical, empirical, and practical resources bring with them, what this project requires from them, and introduce the idea that each system may bring to the others the very strengths that we require.

### **WHY THEM, WHY NOW?**

Why resurrect early twentieth-century teachers for this project? Primarily because they are both still relevant—possibly even more so now than in their own time. Craig Chalquist describes it as “remarkable” that so little of Jung's work is out of date and points to his influence on “systems theory, existential therapy, evolutionary psychology...art therapy, field theory, ecopsychology... [and] narrative therapy's sense of story as primary [among others]: the list gets longer after each careful reading of Jung's letters, seminars, and Collected Works.”

Much of the last century's behaviorally oriented research involving mice, pigeons, and calculators is of no use anymore, if it ever was. But Jung cast light on so many hidden essentials of human nature that, if anything, his work grows more relevant as time goes on—and as mainstream psychology and psychiatry succumb to a Procrustean infatuation with what can be counted and measured. Jung showed us, for example, that the same symptom in different people can mean different things. One person's eye twitches because of an oncoming insight; another's, because he cannot see what's psychologically in front of him. Simple chains of cause and effect fail here. We can only know what a symptom says by entering into deep dialogue with the unconscious mind of its bearer.<sup>2</sup>

Whitehead's relevance, too, has only grown with time. Hosinski describes him as “a philosopher of great speculative boldness, but whose thought was marked by great humility, humility before

---

<sup>2</sup> Craig Chalquist, “Who Was Carl Jung and Why Should We Study Him and His Work?,” accessed November 25, 2016, <http://www.pacificapost.com/who-was-carl-jung-and-why-should-we-study-him-and-his-work>.

the facts of experience and humility with regard to what he had achieved.”<sup>3</sup> His thought has been instrumental in educational reform in China and has been used to influence that country’s postmodern development. It is also being used in many other fields, such as ecological awareness, political thought, ethics, and aesthetics.

Why interweave Whiteheadian and Jungian resources now? Such work is necessary now because neither system on its own is capable of achieving widespread change. Bernard Lee notes that communicating philosophical and theological ideas is difficult because such ideas typically include technical aspects which distance them from the general populace. He sees this as “regrettable,” but not easily avoidable, and writes that if neither Sartre’s *Being and Nothingness* nor Heidegger’s *Being and Time* could ever be best-sellers, then the chances for Whitehead’s *Process and Reality* “are infinitesimal to the point of practical nonexistence.”<sup>4</sup> Whitehead’s philosophy of organism offers much to a world still mired in outdated mechanistic thinking, yet its heavy emphasis on rationality and its intent to appeal to reason might forever relegate it to the margins. Regarding the relative lack of success of the Whiteheadian movement compared to the Jungian movement,<sup>5</sup> Griffin acknowledges Whitehead’s belief that people are “moved more by images than by concepts.”

Whitehead pointed out that ‘it is more important a proposition be interesting than that it be true’—because unless it is interesting, thereby becoming a ‘lure for feeling,’ no one will care whether it is true...Although we may have rationalized our ineffectiveness by telling ourselves that we were casting pearls before swine,

---

<sup>3</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 247.

<sup>4</sup> Bernard J. Lee, *The Becoming of the Church: A Process Theology of the Structures of Christian Experience* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974), 4.

<sup>5</sup> Though it could certainly be argued that Whiteheadian thought is experiencing a resurgence in certain fields such as ecology, it is less well-known than Jungian psychology. On the other hand, it could be argued that the promise of both schools of thought is currently under-exploited.

we were actually—to use another New Testament image—giving hungry people stones, in the form of indigestible concepts.<sup>6</sup>

Charles Hartshorne equally recognizes the need for a “philosophical religion” to go beyond concepts. In *She Who Changes*, feminist and process thinker Carol Christ notes:

Reflecting on his career as a philosopher, Charles Hartshorne acknowledged that ‘a purely philosophical religion has serious limitations. There have to be symbols.’ Philosophical reflection expresses and shapes understanding, but it is through symbols—including images, prayers, songs, dances, movements, meditations, and rituals—that the insights of the mind become part of the feelings of the body and can be shared in community.<sup>7</sup>

Creation, fragmentation, and flux are a necessary part of any world of diverse multiplicity but this is a hard truth for the human heart. Yet it is also true that experiences of integration and transformation at the personal and communal levels seem somehow to carry the grace and power that make bearable and beautiful the fragmentary multiplicity of reality. That same grace and power can re-orient individuals and communities toward a hopeful awareness of our rightful belonging and participation in the interconnected community of life as well as our potential for the creative attainment of value and beauty: to live and to live well, to enjoy what might be called *common flourishing*. I believe that such common flourishing is promoted in the work of Whitehead and Jung. Feminist and Jungian writer Susan Rowland notes the difficulty posed because of a postmodernism that rightfully questions the preeminence of human reason as the source of human identity. “Postmodernists,” she writes,

face a stark choice upon the overthrow of the stable human self characterized by transcendent reason. They can either pursue the partial fragmented consciousness of postmodernity, or they can turn their attention to what the Enlightenment shuddered to contemplate, the unrepresentable irrational other<sup>8</sup>...Jung’s definition

---

<sup>6</sup> David Ray Griffin, “Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 15.

<sup>7</sup> C. Christ, *She Who Changes: Re-Imagining the Divine in the World* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 228.

<sup>8</sup> Susan Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision* (Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2002), 145.

of the unconscious challenges Enlightenment reason in ways that make his work useful to postmodernism.<sup>9</sup>

In this work, I will demonstrate that integrating these two systems of thought offers a generative synthesis wherein new possibilities emerge that transcend and enhance the value of both existing systems.

If Whiteheadian and Jungian frameworks are to be useful here, their schools of thought must positively address the limitations and deleterious effects of a dualistic worldview, the fragmentary nature of human experience, the ability of humans to encounter a life-giving source of dynamism in their everyday lives, the inherent value of all beings and of diversity, the validity of non-sensory experience, the relationship of mind to body (and how such emotional realities as adverse childhood experience can impact adult physical health), and allow access to resources for positive change within everyday human experience that are transformative, liberative, and salvific. In describing process thought as a “living option,” Loomer reflects the demand herein placed on both systems of thought:

Within the fundamental pluralism of this position there is the inherent claim that the heights and depths of existence, including the qualities of profound religious encounters and the resources for living an abundantly meaningful life, are to be experienced within the concrete realities of this world. This contention conjoins the sense of ultimacy in meaning and the immediacy of experienceable actualities (to borrow Bernard Meland's language).<sup>10</sup>

In a nutshell, we bring Whitehead and Jung to this table because they are both relevant, offer ways of thinking about the world and the psyche that promote the wellbeing of all, and can be compellingly combined to achieve the task that neither system can achieve in isolation. Even more importantly, we bring them to the table as viable theoretical and empirical resources that can: (1) show that individuals *matter* and that embodied experience has *value*; (2) show that

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>10</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 29.



individuals *belong* to the greater web of being that is *relational* and overcome dualistic bifurcations between mind and body, self and world, and self and God; (3) describe a God that is real, intimately related to the world, and accessible through embodied human experience; and, (4) show how painful and limiting past experience and decisions can be transcended and *transformed*, hope and faith restored, and new possibilities realized through encounter with a God who is a dynamic, life-giving reality at the base of human experience.

## WHITEHEAD AND JUNG

This is not the first time that Whitehead and Jung have shared a dance. A conference held at Claremont School of Theology in the late 1980s gathered together John Cobb, David Griffin, Catherine Keller, James Hillman, and other Jungian and process scholars and resulted in a collection of essays entitled *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine in Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*.<sup>11</sup> Other than isolated writings by Steve Odin,<sup>12</sup> Chae Young Kim,<sup>13</sup> and Grant Maxwell,<sup>14</sup> there is little evidence of further scholarship along these lines. So why revisit this topic? For one core reason: because a synthesis of process and Jungian resources along with a spiritual practice of dream work, can generate fruitful outcomes that are accessible, compelling, and effective for personal and communal healing and transformation of consciousness. According to Griffin, during the *Archetypal Process* conference there was a recognition that “the two movements share many ideas and fundamental aims. In particular, they both want to return soul and divinity to the world.” Attending scholars posed such questions as

---

<sup>11</sup> David Ray Griffin, ed., *The Archetypal Process* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990).

<sup>12</sup> Steve Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism: A Critical Study of Cumulative Penetration vs. Interpenetration* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1982).

<sup>13</sup> Chae Young Kim, “A Comparison of Alfred North Whitehead’s and Carl Gustav Jung’s Idea of Religion: Special Reference to Their Lectures on Religion,” *Journal of Dharma* 27, no. 3 (July 1, 2002): 417–28.

<sup>14</sup> Grant Maxwell, “Archetype and Eternal Object: Jung, Whitehead, and the Return of Formal Causation,” *Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 3 (Winter 2011): 51–71.

Is it possible for [the two movements] to join forces against the soul-denying and divinity-excluding materialisms and positivisms that they both oppose? Can archetypalists derive cosmological depth, breadth, and support from process theology? Can process theologians acquire a developed, empirically based psychology and a richer, more evocative rhetoric of soul and divinity from archetypalists? More modestly, can people rooted in one of these two movements genuinely converse with those from the other?<sup>15</sup>

The potential for complementarity between the two movements is suggested in the following rudimentary comparison. Whitehead's philosophy of organism describes a cosmos that is always in the process of becoming: reality is dynamic, creative, and event-based and one in which momentary events—or subjects—co-create themselves through their encounters with both an objective past and future possibilities for actualization. Each moment of concreting integration enjoys subjective immediacy *and* internal relations to the whole, is mentally and physically one, and seeks to attain its own value in the world before it becomes an objective datum for the future. The thrust of the creative advance is toward intensity of experience and a divinely-envisaged ever-flowing integration of contrasts that achieves beauty and peace, the point of which, for individuals, is to particularize the whole to enjoy one's unique perspective. Jung's analytical psychology describes an embodied human psyche that is formed through its encounters with an objective and autonomous "other"—the collective unconscious—that plays a compensatory role in offering powerful transpersonal energies and images of transformation to allow the individual to integrate one's psychic oppositions and offer the value of one's own authentic contribution to the whole of life. Individuating is to be a "real" person in real relationship with others and with the God image in the psyche—the Self—that is the ever-flowing source of vitality. Within both schools of thought, the fullness of life of the individual contributes to the fullness of life of the whole.

---

<sup>15</sup> Griffin, "Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements," vii.

## RESONANCES

There are many ways in which Whitehead's and Jung's thought could be said to be "resonant." The term *resonance* is intended here in the musical sense, wherein a vibrating string on a guitar may cause an adjacent string to vibrate sympathetically and in a frequency that might be described as "harmonious." Resonance here suggests a certain degree of *congruence*, rather than identity or equivalence. Resonance is *evocation*. It is meant to describe the potential—clearly unprovable since both men are deceased—for the thought of one man to resonantly engender a positive feeling in the other as to the subject under discussion. The resonances proposed in this section range from their intellectual sophistication, creativity, and visionary nature to their shared ability to communicate using a wide spectrum of scientific to poetic expression and their pragmatic grounding in experience. Both appreciated nonsensory perception and described a unified mind and body. Both rejected many aspects of modernism and were stalwart defenders of value, feeling, and aesthetic imagination. They were also both rooted in the Church yet were vocal critics of its current forms and doctrine. In short, they had much in common.

Jung and Whitehead were recognized as men of great intellect—even as "stellar thinkers"—and Gerald H. Slusser further describes them as "among the most seminal, complex, and sophisticated of any recent writers."<sup>16</sup> Heisig sees the primary gifts of Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman to be their "rational adventures" and their "creative vitality of thought that sees far more connections and speculates on far more possibilities than they are able to track down and reason

---

<sup>16</sup> Slusser, "Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth," 77.

out systematically.”<sup>17</sup> J’nan Morse Sellery calls them “adventurers of ideas”<sup>18</sup> and “poets” who had to “grapple with their inner daimons...[both] had to stop willing knowledge and to let intuition or the creative instinct forge its way into their minds.”<sup>19</sup> Like all poets and visionaries,

they paid the price of conscious *devotion*, directed *energy*, and intuitive *insight* in order to confront the hollows, depths, and terrors of their visions...What both Jung and Whitehead had to rely upon were the narratives (be they myths or dreams) that others had heard and retold in order to make their vision or story palatable. But their experiences were deeper, wider, greater, broader in vision and scope than the old narrative tales. Theirs was not unlike Harry’s problem in Eliot’s *The Family Reunion* when, at the end of Scene II, he is ready to follow the Eumenides: ‘And now I know/ That my business is not to run away, but to pursue,/ Not to avoid being found, but to seek./ I would not have chosen this way, had there been any other!/ It is at once the hardest thing, and the only thing possible./ Now they will lead me. I shall be safe with them.’

Each could be scientifically precise, expressing difficult concepts with scholarly intellectualism; yet Robertson points to Jung’s work as abounding “in poetic passages that better capture the majesty of their subject,”<sup>20</sup> words that apply equally to Whitehead.

Whitehead breaks from what W. Norman Pittenger calls the “older mode of metaphysics” where one begins with “general principles assumed to be true rather than studying concrete phenomena.” Instead, Whitehead begins on the ground of first-hand human awareness, then “takes off” like an aviator to observe from the highest and widest perspective possible, finally returning to direct experience.<sup>21</sup> Though it could be said that Whitehead used his ideas to “unflinchingly explore experience with the aid of those ideas”<sup>22</sup> and Jung used his own and his patients’ experiences to suggest possible models within which to understand those experiences,

---

<sup>17</sup> Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” 183.

<sup>18</sup> J’nan Morse Sellery, “The Necessity for Symbol and Myth: A Literary Amplification,” in *Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 107.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 99.

<sup>20</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 139.

<sup>21</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 16–17.

<sup>22</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 23.

both were deeply bound to *experience*. Though both could be considered supreme thinkers, Whitehead considered the “infinite fullness of experience” to be “supreme over thought”<sup>23</sup> and Jung would have wholeheartedly agreed. One of Whitehead’s most radical notions is that we can extrapolate about the nature of the entire cosmos from what we can learn from our most intimate and basic human experience; in fact, embodied human experience “is the only source of data and evidence for philosophical reflection.”<sup>24</sup> Similarly, Jung believed that “the facts of nature are the basis of all knowledge”<sup>25</sup> and that his own experience “was a reliable guide to the [overall] human situation.”<sup>26</sup> Moreover, Jung

believed that what works out in practice is likely to be close to the reality of things. Underlying this idea was his understanding that human life is not just a chance development in the universe, but one of the highest products of a meaningful process. What tends to further, to free and enhance human life is likely to be close to the inner meaning of the universe. Therefore, the man who lives his humanity as fully and deeply as possible is most likely to find understanding of the depth and nature of the universe, and he is also the one who expresses that central nature.<sup>27</sup>

Empirical and pragmatic, Jung would not dismiss the paranormal experiences of others “out-of-hand as superstition” because if such experiences were “psychic realities” he wanted to know why, even if that experience did not align with his preconceived assumptions about reality.<sup>28</sup> Similarly, Whitehead affords nonsensory perception “primacy”<sup>29</sup> and, in fact, insists that to dismiss “instances of non-sensuous perception” would be to commit a “fatal error barring the advance of systematic metaphysics.”<sup>30</sup> Both men shared an atypical comfort with paradoxical thinking: Jung accepted “scientific-intellectual aspects of life and the religious-nonrational

---

<sup>23</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 84.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 42–43.

<sup>25</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 139.

<sup>26</sup> Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” 88.

<sup>27</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 106.

<sup>28</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 140.

<sup>29</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 2.

<sup>30</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, Paperback (New York: The Free Press, 1933), 180.

aspects” as held together within “the same reality, as polar opposites on a single axis”<sup>31</sup> and Whitehead, too, holds science and religion in “creative relation,” believing both to “concern the one world of our experience.”<sup>32</sup> Process thought emphasizes the kind of wholeness that recognizes both “the aesthetic *and* the scientific” and “feeling-tones as well as precise observation and experiment.”<sup>33</sup> Jung, writes Tacey, is an “amalgam of mythos and logos, story and science” whose thought belongs neither to “the arts faculty or in the life science faculty” but rather to a “university system that does not yet exist, one in which the whole of life is studied and taken seriously. Jung is the scientist and artist of life integration.”<sup>34</sup> For both Whitehead and Jung, rational thinking is inextricably interwoven with feeling and aesthetic value.

Neither Whitehead nor Jung saw biology as solely determinative of the individual or culture; both rejected the kind of physicalism that sees “human consciousness as an *epiphenomenon* of physical existence.”<sup>35</sup> Instead, Jung presupposed that “self-reflection and adult intentionality emerge from an *a priori* structure, an intelligence that is unconscious”; similarly, Whitehead believed that conscious thought emerges from *a priori* roots in unconscious perception. In his “philosophy of life,” Jung adamantly refused to fragment the human psyche, demanding instead that people be seen as “unitary and total beings—encompassing everything that every psychological approach says that we are.”<sup>36</sup> Moreover, his system accounts for “complex interactions between conscious and unconscious processes without reducing them to

---

<sup>31</sup> June K. Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung’s Psychology*, Revised (New York: Anchor Books, 1994), xiii.

<sup>32</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 229, 232.

<sup>33</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 14.

<sup>34</sup> Tacey, “The Challenge of Teaching Jung in the University,” 16.

<sup>35</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, 18.

<sup>36</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 9.

brain functions or learning theories.”<sup>37</sup> As Faber notes, Whitehead similarly refused a bifurcated world wherein

Either intellect, subjectivity, and personality had to be reduced to material processes—ultimately to the local movements of elementary particles—or knowledge of nature had to recede into an insurmountably remote distance as a projection of human conceptual patterns (the inaccessibility of the ‘thing in itself’). Whitehead's thought resisted both alternatives and instead sought to reattain the *unity* of experience.<sup>38</sup>

When postmodernity was still just a twinkle in modernity’s eyes, Jung and Whitehead rejected core ideas of the modern worldview, such as

1. The *mechanistic doctrine of nature*, according to which natural things are wholly devoid of sentience, experience, or interiority, of any power of self-determination or ‘final causation,’ and of any power to act or be affected at a distance...;
2. *Sensate empiricism*, according to which all knowledge originates in sensory perception, so that all extrasensory or nonsensory perception is denied...and,
3. The *denial of any divine presence*, especially any present divine influence, in the world.<sup>39</sup>

Korean scholar Chae Young Kim recognizes this area of commonality when he writes that despite their different academic backgrounds, they shared a disdain for mechanistic/materialistic philosophies and psychologies and “came to realize that the contemporary philosophy and psychology had excluded the transcendental dimension of life.”<sup>40</sup>

Neither accepted a “value-free” or “contextless” reality: Whitehead believed that “Value is inherent in actuality itself” because “The purpose of God is the attainment of value in the

---

<sup>37</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, xv.

<sup>38</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 22.

<sup>39</sup> Griffin, “Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements,” 4–5.

<sup>40</sup> Kim, “A Comparison of Alfred North Whitehead’s and Carl Gustav Jung’s Idea of Religion,” 418.

temporal world.”<sup>41</sup> For him, the epistemological process is “teleological,” “characterized by both interest and goal,” and “fulfilled only in an (eschatological) process whereby the world itself becomes whole.”<sup>42</sup> According to Rowland, although Jung tended toward “grand narratives to anchor his psychology...he does not suggest that [his philosophy] can supply a neutral foundation for knowledge”; rather, much of his work “slides into the category of personal myth

because Jung’s reason, situated in the ego, is dependent upon *his* other, the interventions of the superior unknowable unconscious. Jung never pretends to a reason shorn of ‘personal’ factors.’ Therefore Jung’s attempts to structure his theory as a grand narrative, what I have called ‘grand theory,’ can never wholly be separated from the drive to personal myth *because* the most crucial proposition of the unknowable unconscious means that Jung cannot hold the Enlightenment principles of a superior, truth-perceiving reason.<sup>43</sup>

She goes on to argue that Jung’s work has a certain “affinity with postmodernism” in his theory of the unconscious due to its “unrepresentable, *unwritable*” and “inconceivable” nature. Jung’s collective unconscious, his “founding presence” becomes a “founding absence from the writing.” For Jung, then, as in postmodernism, “language is not a reliable and transparent window onto meaning, truth and the world.”<sup>44</sup> Heisig describes Whitehead’s approach as “congenial” to Jung’s archetypal psychology in their mutual rejection of “concern with any unknowable that might lie beyond the reach of human experience.” On his part, Whitehead “admits to the ‘asymptotic’ and even ‘metaphorical’ nature of all attempts to formulate metaphysical first principles in precise terms.”<sup>45</sup> Comparing Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman, Heisig continues,

First, they clearly mean to acknowledge the need for that ‘imaginative flight’ of reason that lifts one above the rational field of consciousness and opens up a perspective in which experience for the first time can become ‘fact’ and ‘theory.’ Second, they mean to defend their respective conceptual schemes by appeal to an arational ground given apart from those schemes. And third, they wish to draw

---

<sup>41</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, Reissue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), 87.

<sup>42</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 8.

<sup>43</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 139.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” 179.



attention to the improvements they have wrought on existing theories by giving better accounts of the publicly accessible data. In a word, although Whitehead was the only one of the three who seemed eager to say so, for all of them empiricism meant nothing less than an open commitment to ‘that ultimate rationalism which urges forward science and philosophy alike.’<sup>46</sup>

Both Whitehead and Jung criticized traditional doctrines of God and formulated alternatives that they felt were positive and beneficial for humanity. Often, they seem to point to similar realities using differing terms. Their shared acceptance of nonsensory perception led them to also share a rejection of the “antithesis between ideas and feelings.” Griffin notes that Whitehead considered a thought to be “a tremendous mode of excitement” and of having “great importance,” with one form of such importance being “holiness,” and considers this to be “parallel to Jung’s focus on ‘numinous’ ideas.”<sup>47</sup>

Both systems posit a processive nature to the lives of both the individual soul and the world, with growth and positive change held as core values. Griffin suggests that both men “made the psyche or soul central” and links Jung’s statement that “Psychic existence is the only category of existence of which we have immediate knowledge” with Whitehead’s thought that “the percipient occasion is its own standard of actuality,” as an indication that both men “regard the human soul as the most powerful of all earthly creatures.”<sup>48</sup> Though Jung certainly focused more on the individual psyche, Rowland considers his theory to be “a theory of psyche and culture” as well as “a therapeutic methodology.”<sup>49</sup> While Jung’s focus on individuation and Whitehead’s focus on internal relations may appear to be at odds, differences fade to the background when their underlying goals are in view. Although many process thinkers stress the

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Griffin, “Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements,” 9.

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., 7, 11.

<sup>49</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 28.

relationality of process thought—the understanding that individuals are internally constituted by their relationships—it is the achievement of value that is the *reason for becoming* in the first place. Kraus writes,

‘For-one’s-selfness’ becomes ‘for-the-others-and-for-the-totality.’ ‘Everything that in any sense exists has two sides, namely, its individual self and its significance in the universe’ (MT 151). These two poles cannot be torn apart. Each finds its fulfillment in the other via their dialectical relation. Thus, becoming is for the purpose of being (signification in the universe) and being is for the purpose of novel becoming (the emergent individual self)...But subjectivity itself is not the result of an underlying subject’s activity of relating objects to itself, of a one weaving a many into the pre-existent unity of its oneness. It is, rather the ‘growing together’ (con-crescence) of objects to create a novel subject which enriches the many from which it springs. ‘The many become one and are increased by one’ (PR 32). The entire world finds its place in the internal constitution of the new creature, and the new creature lays an obligation upon the future: that it take into account the value achieved by the new creature. Thus every creature both houses and pervades the world.<sup>50</sup>

Interestingly, both men were sons of pastors, one from the Anglican tradition and the other from the Reformed.<sup>51</sup> Yet neither believed that the central aspect of religion lay in its “institutions, organizations, scriptures, rituals, belief systems and so on—but in the subject’s heart involved in his or her own religion.” In other words,” writes Kim, “Whitehead and Jung thought of the subject’s internal experience as the essence of religion.” For Whitehead, this internal experience was grounded in what he called “solitariness,” and being apart from “collective enthusiasms.” For Jung, inner experience stemmed from being possessed by, or having an encounter with, the *numinosum*, a phrase he drew from the work of Rudolf Otto.<sup>52</sup> In Whitehead’s “solitariness,” one experiences a transformation of consciousness, and for Jung as well, one must draw away from the collective in order to be transformed; Jung uses the term

---

<sup>50</sup> Elizabeth M. Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience: A Companion to Whitehead’s Process and Reality* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979), 3.

<sup>51</sup> Kim, “A Comparison of Alfred North Whitehead’s and Carl Gustav Jung’s Idea of Religion,” 418.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 421.

“religion” to denote “the attitude peculiar to consciousness which has been changed by experience of the *numinosum*.”<sup>53</sup> For Georg Nicolaus, who has compared Jung’s work to that of Nicolai Berdyaev, Jung’s thought reveals a “significant affinity” with process theology, partly due to his use of the concept of the *numinosum* and its relationship to transformation.<sup>54</sup>

Both Jung and Whitehead felt strongly that religion should be self-critical and remain open to its own transformation, or else it is “inclined to lose its original transcendental power and to remain a dead formal tradition.”<sup>55</sup> Jung wrote that the importance of a “religious attitude” in one’s psychic life “can hardly be overrated,” though in his seeking of religion’s transformation he was unwilling to completely jettison the past because “it is precisely for the religious outlook that the sense of historical continuity is indispensable.”<sup>56</sup> Kim summarizes their strong core commonalities in this way: “the essence of religion is not in the memory of doctrines but the experience of solitariness and *numinosum* which is always refreshing and extending the human’s consciousness.”<sup>57</sup>

In summary, among many similarities, of primary importance is the fact that both Whitehead and Jung begin “on the ground”—with real, lived human experience—rather than beginning with abstract, disembodied grand theory, yet both believed that we could extrapolate from the specific to the whole, from the personal to the transpersonal. Both challenged many modernist assumptions, such as reigning theories of perception and physicalism. Moreover, both men believed that religion and philosophy must be self-critical and open to change.

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid., 423.

<sup>54</sup> Georg Nicolaus, *C.G. Jung and Nikolai Berdyaev: Individuation and the Person: A Critical Comparison* (London, New York: Routledge, 2010), 117–18, 127.

<sup>55</sup> Kim, “A Comparison of Alfred North Whitehead’s and Carl Gustav Jung’s Idea of Religion,” 423.

<sup>56</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 67. This sense of continuity with the past is also resonant with Whitehead’s understanding of the effect of the past on the concrescence of actual entities.

<sup>57</sup> Kim, “A Comparison of Alfred North Whitehead’s and Carl Gustav Jung’s Idea of Religion,” 425.

## CONTRASTS

The names I give do not imply a philosophy, although I cannot prevent people from barking at these terminological phantoms as if they were metaphysical...  
—C. G. Jung, *The Practice of Psychotherapy*

While their thought seems to share many resonances, of course there are significant differences between Whitehead's and Jung's approaches to their specific areas of concern. It is these contrasts to which we now turn. Though certainly not an exhaustive analysis of every difference or potential conflict between process thought and analytical psychology, in this section we will look at the differing ways that they approach metaphysical speculation, what is psychological versus what is ontological, and their differing preferences toward *logos* versus *mythos* thinking.

Differences that Griffin identifies include that Whitehead deals mainly with concepts while Jung deals primarily with images and that while Whitehead was focused on cosmology first and the soul in a secondary way, Jung was most interested in the soul first and cosmology later. In contrast to his eloquent and lengthy discussion of the cosmos, regarding the self, Hopper acknowledges that it appears that "Whitehead has comparatively little to say." Yet, in digging deeper, he finds that in *Process and Reality*, Whitehead relates "soul" and "mind" to "actual entity" and "actual occasion, and concludes that "it would appear that a concern for the soul has been integral to the entire essay in cosmology."<sup>58</sup> He continues,

We come nearer, perhaps, to Whitehead's real thought about the self at two points. There is, first, the persistence with which he carries his insights constantly into his dominant concern, which is that the essence of real actuality is process. Thus his views of the self are descriptive, and arise out of the environment of process. Process is inherent in God's nature and therefore inherent in the

---

<sup>58</sup> Stanley R. Hopper, "Once More: The Cavern beneath the Cave," in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 112.

becoming (and perishing) of personal identity. The soul, by a synthesis of the momenta of its environment, adds a new fact: it becomes the bearer of imaginative novelty (MT 26, 30; AI 78, 275). There is, second, Whitehead's occasional references to the 'depths' of reality. 'The relata of Reality must lie below the stale presuppositions of verbal thought' (AI 267). God, out of 'the depths of his existence...adds himself to the actual ground from which every creative act takes its rise' (RM 148, 149). This movement into creative act results from the 'urges' of the soul's 'indwelling Eros' (AI 275), which is another way of speaking of God, who is the completed ideal harmony, without whom the Creativity of the universe and the 'realm of forms with infinite possibilities' would be impotent to achieve any creative actualizations (RM 115).

Another apparent contrast is that regarding the ills of the world, Keller accuses Whitehead of "ontological serenity" and distinguishes Whitehead's tendency to "sublimate diagnosis too much into descriptions" from Jung's tendency to "turn diagnosis too easily into prescriptions." On the other hand, she claims Jung's insight into the "great dramas of unwholesomeness" to be "hardly paralleled in depth and imagination."<sup>59</sup> Probably their most significant areas of difference are evident in their approaches to metaphysical speculation, their psychological vs. ontological perspectival centers, and the degree to which they preferenced *logos* or *mythos*, the rational or the nonrational.

### Metaphysical Speculation

Whereas Whitehead dove unabashedly into the realm of speculative metaphysics, Jung generally avoided it, refusing to theorize beyond the "limits of experience" because he believed such metaphysical leaps to be "always in danger of becoming nonsense on one side, or the mere subjective projection of its author on the other."<sup>60</sup> For the most part, he limited himself to descriptions of what he encountered in his clinical work and his personal deep dives into the unconscious. This may have been due as much to Jung's perspective that psychology was "too

---

<sup>59</sup> Keller, "Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection," 143.

<sup>60</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 106.

young of a science to develop a theoretical superstructure”<sup>61</sup> as it was to his personal proclivities. “Every so often,” writes Rowland of Jung, “he will even make statements that imply a deep-rooted resistance to the whole notion of ‘theory’ with its connotations of objectivity, rationality and scientific validity. One such example is when he suggests that ideas ‘create’ the person rather than the other way round.”<sup>62</sup> Jung was a “superb model-maker” but he “never confused his models with reality.”<sup>63</sup> Hillman acknowledges that depth psychology<sup>64</sup> “abstracts all the time” but contends that its abstractions are “faithfully phenomenological and do not abstract [from the given] into more inclusive generalization”; instead, they “seek to drop the bottom out of the given.”<sup>65</sup>

Jung’s reluctance to embrace metaphysics applies equally to speculation about God or the numinous reality that one encountered within. His stance is strictly “phenomenological” when he argues that God “is an experience, not a concept.”<sup>66</sup> Jung concerned himself only with “occurrences, events, experiences—in a word, with facts.” At the same time, he considered the same idea held by numerous individuals—whether based in objective reality or not—to be a “psychic fact” or *consensus gentium*.<sup>67</sup> Because Jung’s unconscious—by definition—is “*unthinkable*, not knowable, not securely mappable...always a mysterious and frequently terrifying power in the mind” it cannot possibly “be adequately theorized.”<sup>68</sup> Finding more in common with Lao Tzu’s insistence that “The Tao that can be told of is not the eternal Tao,” Jung

---

<sup>61</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 142.

<sup>62</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 24.

<sup>63</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 141.

<sup>64</sup> Depth psychology is a broad term that refers to any psychological system that takes the relationship between the conscious and unconscious parts of the psyche into account. It includes, but is not limited to, the work of Jung.

<sup>65</sup> Hillman, “Back to Beyond: On Cosmology,” 219.

<sup>66</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 113.

<sup>67</sup> C. G. Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, ed. Violet Staub De Laszlo, Reprint (New York: Modern Library, 1993), 584.

<sup>68</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 25.

believed that the metaphysics entertained in Western religion had become “an obstacle to direct experience of the divine.”<sup>69</sup> He insisted on bringing metaphysics “within the range of experience” because “to understand metaphysically is impossible; it can only be done psychologically.”<sup>70</sup>

### **Psychological vs. Ontological**

Whereas Whitehead wanted to “frame a coherent, logical, necessary system of general ideas,” Jung thought such a system unreachable “because we have no Archimedean point outside the psyche from which to frame such a system.”<sup>71</sup> Had Jung been aware of—and persuaded by—Whitehead’s additional mode of perception in the form of causal efficacy, whereby experiencing subjects are able to perceive the objective past physically and unconsciously, he might not have concluded that “All comprehension and all that is comprehended is in itself psychic.” To be fair, Jung did not assume that no objective world existed outside the mind, only that we “cannot see beyond the psyche.” Heisig compares Jung’s problem of the “psychological circle”—where “consciousness cannot become an object to itself”—to what he calls Whitehead’s “ontological circle,” or the claim that it is a “fiction” to imagine a world made up of “subjects viewing a world of objects” without internal relations.<sup>72</sup> We can safely assume, on the other hand, that Whitehead and Jung would agree that holding any metaphysical or scientific truth “for all time”<sup>73</sup> would be a “fallacy of misplaced concreteness.”<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Harold Coward, “Taoism and Jung: Synchronicity and the Self,” *Philosophy East and West* 46, no. 4 (1996): 488, doi:10.2307/1399493.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” 86.

<sup>72</sup> Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” 181.

<sup>73</sup> Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” 86.

<sup>74</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne, Corrected (New York, London: Free Press, 1979), 52.

## Logos vs. Mythos

Another point of distinction is the degree to which each valued rational consciousness or *logos* vs. unconscious *mythos*: clearly, Whitehead placed a higher value on rationality while Jung held the conscious and unconscious aspects of human life as equally valid and necessary. Certainly, for Jung, *mythos* was not something that civilization could ever—nor *should* ever—eliminate. In contrast, Whitehead believed that the advance of civilization *required* that humans reject the “uncontrollable” and superstitious symbols of their “savage past” and felt that humans are both attracted to and repulsed by symbols because “hard-headed men want facts and not symbols.”<sup>75</sup> Although Keller is no stranger to Whitehead’s poetic and mystical side, she blames his philosophical preferences for “mathematic pattern” over “music,” his “lack of mythos,” and his “Victorian sanguinity” for leaving “psyche starved for images.”<sup>76</sup> On the other hand, Whitehead also understood symbolism (of language) to be “essential for the higher grades of life.”<sup>77</sup> Slusser makes the case that Whitehead’s work is replete with symbols “that refer to forms of process that are not more than partially available to direct experience and consciousness”; he considers Whitehead’s concept of *God* (both *primordial* and *consequent* natures) to be “supremely symbolic” and notes that even something as basic as “*actual occasion* must be viewed as symbol.”<sup>78</sup> In his most mystical moments, Whitehead may have agreed with Jung that our “regrettably demythologized and desouled world” demanded both logos “accountability to the rationally critical functions” *and* “an appreciation of the mythos perspective.”<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect*, Revised (New York: Fordham University Press, 1985), 60.

<sup>76</sup> Keller, “Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection,” 142.

<sup>77</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 183.

<sup>78</sup> Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” 85–86.

<sup>79</sup> Walter Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos in the Thought of Carl Jung: The Theory of the Collective Unconscious in Scientific Perspective* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988), 4.



As I have shown, there are differences between Whitehead's and Jung's perspectives on metaphysical and psychological reality. Whitehead deals primarily with concepts, while Jung focuses on images and the imaginal. Jung generally avoided metaphysical speculation while Whitehead is metaphysical speculator *par excellence*. Whitehead draws an "ontological circle" while Jung draws a "psychological circle" and Whitehead typically preferences rationality while Jung equally values rationality and nonrationality. Despite these differences—and *maybe even because of them*—we can interweave the most life-enhancing aspects of their thought into a liberative tapestry that is founded upon lived experience.

## CRITIQUES AND RESPONSES

As beautiful and as life-enhancing as the threads in our tapestry are, we must not avert our eyes from the valid critiques that have been voiced toward both Whitehead and Jung. At the same time, we must remember that both men—as well as their successors—were clay-footed humans with certain limitation to their thinking. As a result, both have drawn criticism. In this section, critiques will be briefly acknowledged and responses will be sufficiently noted. A key assumption—especially in a project which relies on the embodied theological method—is that experience is the beginning and end of all of their theorizing. Both clearly acknowledged the need for reformation of any thought that is not supported by empirical experience. Therefore, as we approach this task from a feminist-influenced embodied theological method that preferences experience, we are free to utilize the resources in each school of thought that are liberative and life-giving while being equally free to question any perspective that does not stand up to empirical evidence or is not liberative and life-enhancing. As Whitehead, in his humility, surmised: "There remains the final reflection, how shallow, puny, and imperfect are efforts to sound the depths in the nature of things. In philosophical"—and in psycho-spiritual—

“discussion, the merest hint of dogmatic certainty as to finality of statement is an exhibition of folly.”<sup>80</sup>

## Whitehead and Whiteheadians

### *Language*

Whitehead’s writing style—described by Griffin as “literal” and “prosaic”<sup>81</sup>—can be quite off-putting. As Carol Christ notes in *She Who Changes*,

In order to read Whitehead’s most profound ideas about the nature of God, one must wade through his opaque and difficult *Process and Reality*, a work filled with neologisms (made-up words and words used in other than their normal sense) that is daunting even to professional philosophers. Whitehead believed that philosophy should be modeled on mathematics, which means that his goal was to use language with a kind of numerical precision, not to communicate with anyone unfamiliar with his technical vocabulary.<sup>82</sup>

Legend has it that while hundreds of interested listeners attended the first lecture in the series that eventually became *Process and Reality*, by the last lecture, attendance was in the single digits. It is not just that his work is academic and dense, but that his technical jargon and detailed exploration of minute concepts can make one want to commence head banging. Yet, even in the midst of his highly technical writing in *Process and Reality*, he can wax poetically and mystically eloquent. Sarkar describes these as Whitehead’s “extreme tendencies,” and notes his two “dominant moods” as “extreme philosophic and scientific analysis” and “extreme emotional expression.”<sup>83</sup> Generally, Whiteheadian thought is typically criticized for being overly

---

<sup>80</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 248.

<sup>81</sup> David Ray Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Lock Our Ailing World,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 247.

<sup>82</sup> Christ, *She Who Changes*, 14–15.

<sup>83</sup> Anil Kumar Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives: Ways and Prospects of Process-Philosophy* (Patna: Bharati Bhawan, 1974), 113.

conceptual. Though Loomer sees Whitehead as “balanced,” he has claimed that “What I dislike in so many Whiteheadians is a loss of this balance and a great emphasis on the left hemisphere, the logical side of things.”<sup>84</sup> While Griffin acknowledges that Whitehead can occasionally write in a “lyrical” fashion, he bemoans the fact that “most of us Whiteheadians have continued to use the dull, prosaic style appropriate to the disenchanting world of the mechanists.”<sup>85</sup>

### *Elitist and Overly Optimistic*

Feminist theologians have also “pointedly” critiqued process thought not only as being “overly abstract” and “rational,” but also as “elitist, and hence not easily accessible to the marginalized communities to which feminists hold themselves accountable.” As Lucinda Huffaker notes,

It may be too accommodating and optimistic about evolutionary advancement, and insufficiently attentive to and critical of political dynamics and structures, making it inadequate for supporting feminist commitments to advocacy and praxis.<sup>86</sup>

She argues that some aspects of process thought may “perpetuate hidden patriarchal imbalances” through “overvaluing conscious experience and prioritizing novelty and dynamic process to the disparagement of continuity and rest.”<sup>87</sup> Such a claim is disputed by Pittinger who reminds us that in Whitehead’s system, “everything contributes to make a unity of some sort” that is interested in “cosmos, not chaos, with order not anarchy.” This is a perspective often lost in contemporary society.

---

<sup>84</sup> William D. Dean, “Introduction: From Size to Integrity,” in *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, ed. William D. Dean and Larry E. Axel (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 8. Dean attributes this quote to Loomer’s lecture at the University of Montana called “Notes on Beauty as a Design for Life.”

<sup>85</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Lock Our Ailing World,” 247.

<sup>86</sup> Lucinda A. Huffaker, “Feminist Theology in Process Perspective,” in *Handbook of Process Theology*, ed. Donna Bowman and Jay McDaniel, Annotated (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006), 186.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 187.

The vast accumulation of information and the need for developing special skills make it impossible to possess more than a very partial and limited grasp of ‘things entire.’ Yet when this patent fact is pushed to extreme limits, it can and has produced a fragmentation of human existence and an incapacity to entertain a synoptic view of things...The sense of wholeness has diminished, and as a result we feel we are less than full persons and we see our world as an assemblage of disparate and unrelated entities. The process perspective changes this. Not only does it *assume* that there is cosmos and not chaos, but it is also concerned to *show* that this is the case.<sup>88</sup>

In his overly “optimistic” view of “evolutionary advancement,” Whitehead can be seen as “insufficiently attentive to and critical of political dynamics and structures,”<sup>89</sup> while his processive view of history leads him to refer to indigenous religions as “primitive.” As Monica Coleman contends,

Both *Religion in the Making* and *Adventures of Ideas* reflect a social Darwinism that describes the evolution of religions and societies as moving from lower to higher. The civilizations and religions that he describes as tribal and social tend to be ones that we could call ‘indigenous’ today. The civilizations and religions that are described as rational and civilized are associated with Europe (Christianity) and Asia (Buddhism). In Whitehead’s scheme, African traditional religions are ‘lower,’ ‘social’ religions that are merely a stage in the evolutionary process toward a ‘rational religion.’ [supersessionism] Using Whitehead for any postmodern discussion of evil and wholeness requires a rejection of these aspects of his discussion.<sup>90</sup>

Whitehead’s optimism leads him to trust that evolving societal forms will be “increasingly complex, harmonious, interesting, and, by implication, higher. This attitude is also a reflection of modernity’s hope in itself and in the progress of civilization.” In company with other feminist theologians, Coleman, William R. Jones, and Thandeka agree that Whitehead does not distinguish between the suffering that is “endemic to the entire human race” and the more targeted “suffering which is meted out by one ethnic group to another.”<sup>91</sup> Moreover, whereas

---

<sup>88</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 12.

<sup>89</sup> Huffaker, “Feminist Theology in Process Perspective,” 186.

<sup>90</sup> Monica A. Coleman, *Making a Way Out of No Way: A Womanist Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008), 78.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 80.

Whitehead's God is "rational" and has "the manners of an English gentleman," Coleman reminds us that "a postmodern theology cannot guarantee a happy ending,"<sup>92</sup> a statement with which Whitehead would ultimately agree.

It is true that Whiteheadian thought can be overly conceptual and too ratiocentric. Bringing the imaginal perspective inherent in Jungian thought to the table could balance the heavy inclination in process thought toward concepts, with its emphasis on rationality and its intent to appeal to reason. As Griffin notes, "Hillman is certainly correct in urging us to use language appropriate to an animate world and a soul that is responsive to the world's aesthetic aliveness."<sup>93</sup> Whitehead's generous perspective on progress has already been addressed by such process theologians as Keller who urges us to reclaim the chaotic *tehom*, but it can be brought into balance even more through a synthesis with Jungian thought and its deep respect for the "shadow side of reality."<sup>94</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 79.

<sup>93</sup> Griffin, "A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World," 247.

<sup>94</sup> John A. Sanford, *Evil: The Shadow Side of Reality* (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1986), passim.

## Jung and Jungians

Naomi Goldenberg, a feminist scholar of the psychology of religion, relates that she “became interested in Jung and Jungian thought after two years of work and study in the feminist movement.”<sup>95</sup> Whereas “traditional religions reinforced the subjugation of women,” and before many alternatives of religious expression for women began to emerge, she saw Jung as “the thinker to whom I turned for methods of understanding religious growth outside of traditional institutions.”<sup>96</sup> In 1977, Goldenberg offered a “feminist revision of Jung” to use his work “constructively” so a feminist might be able to “accept and reinterpret what feels right about it for herself.”<sup>97</sup> Some of the problems she addressed then were: her perceived “veneration” of Jung, the man; his sometimes contradictory statements; and the sexism of his theories.<sup>98</sup> But by 1985, Goldenberg advocated a complete abandonment of Jungian theory in favor of Freud, based on her view of Jung’s archetypal theory. Equating archetypes with Platonic forms, she interprets them as “perfect” and “vastly superior” to actualized reality, including the flawed body.<sup>99</sup> She describes archetypes as “unchanging and unchangeable...transcendent ideals” while our “‘images,’ i.e., our experiences, are only inferior copies.”<sup>100</sup>

I will not present here Goldenberg’s reasoning about why mind-body dualism is dangerous, as there is no quarrel there, but I will show in Chapter 4 that her charge of dualism is misplaced. Goldenberg interprets archetypes as “determining” of human thought patterns, as a kind of controlling external deity, and this sense of the archetypes as oppressive colors much of

---

<sup>95</sup> Goldenberg, “Jung After Feminism,” 53.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, 53–54.

<sup>97</sup> *Ibid.*, 53, 55.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, 55–56.

<sup>99</sup> Naomi R. Goldenberg, “Archetypal Theory and the Separation of Mind and Body: Reason Enough to Turn to Freud?,” *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 55.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 61–63.

her writing. Demaris Wehr picks up this notion when she describes Jung's psychology as "contextless," and one in which "Archetypal factors that transcend time and space (and thus transcend context) are seen as the main shaping forces in individual personality."<sup>101</sup> While viewing archetypes as "contextless," feminists contrastingly view Jungian psychology as lacking in "awareness of the political dimension of symbols" and therefore tending to "reinforce the status quo" and supporting the "gender-based social order from which it sprang."<sup>102</sup> In summary, feminists accuse Jung and Jungians of being foundationalists or essentialists, of separating mind from body and placing all reality in a disembodied "psyche," and of describing an archetypal reality that is universal, ahistorical, and divinely coercive. Jung has been criticized for being venerated and, even more alarmingly, as anti-Semitic and a Nazi sympathizer. Is it possible to wade through these critiques and reclaim any of his work for the express purposes of this project?

### *Archetypal Theory*

To see Jung's archetypal reality as representing a transcendent realm of "ideal" forms of perfection that carry a divine caveat insistent upon the universal actualization of predetermined behaviors is to misread his theory. As will be shown in various sections throughout this work, Jung, in his later writing, more clearly distinguished between archetypes and archetypal images: while the archetypes themselves are abstract and transpersonal, they are not "ideal." The images, on the other hand, are completely contextual—in either a personal or cultural way. Neither the archetypes themselves nor the images are deterministic, but the images certainly carry the

---

<sup>101</sup> Demaris S. Wehr, *Jung & Feminism: Liberating Archetypes* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), 14.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

pressure of history and can feel “sovereign,” due both to their “numinosity” and to the sense that they are encountered as a objective “other” in the psyche.

We might better understand archetypal theory as reflecting the human tendency to collect experiences and form images around a behavioral theme, such as what it means to be a mother, a father, a woman, a man, or even just a unified self. For presumably as long as humanity in its modern form has existed, we have understood there to be such categories as “mother”, “father,” etc., even while each culture or epoch has defined the behavior of that “category” for itself. Specific definitions may evolve but the need to define what it means to act like a “mother” is universally human. The images and experiences that are collected around such a center are personal, cultural, historical, and contextual, but the *tendency* to categorize and define human behavior in this way is universal. It seems the fields of evolutionary psychology and neuropsychology may end up supporting Jung’s theories in an interesting—and probably unintentional—way. Evolutionary psychology argues that it would make sense that there are behavioral structures in the brain that have co-evolved along with the physical structures that are required to carry out adaptive behaviors. Lee Kirkpatrick describes these as being species-specific, but universal to that species.<sup>103</sup> On the other hand, it is their interaction with particular environments or contexts that produce the variations and diversity of forms of behavior that we witness. From my perspective, it seems that if there were not some kind of inherited predispositions of behavior that were particular to humans, then it would be necessary for every individual born to re-invent basic human behaviors over and over again. That seems to be incredibly inefficient from an evolutionary perspective. Jung was an empiricist who described

---

<sup>103</sup> Lee A Kirkpatrick, “Evolutionary Psychology: An Emerging New Foundation for the Psychology of Religion,” in *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, ed. Raymond F. Paloutzian and Crystal L. Park (New York: The Guilford Press, 2005), 101–19.



what he found in the experiences of his patients and who refused to speculate on any transcendent reality that might be behind the images. He notes that “One must constantly bear in mind that what we mean by ‘archetype’ is in itself irrepresentable, but that it has effects which enable us to visualize it, namely the archetypal image.”<sup>104</sup> He observed the effects and subsequently theorized on the cause.

Far from being “disembodied,” Jung saw the archetypes as being “inherited with the brain structure” and “hidden in the depths of the psyche.” For him, not only is the psyche not separate from the body, but I will show later that it is not even separate from the rest of nature. When Jung uses terms like “transcendent” or “beyond the psyche” to describe the archetypes, I believe he means that they “transcend” the individual in the sense that they are “transpersonal.” They “go beyond” the individual psyche and the individual culture—while still being grounded within them—and he believed this was true because of the “mythologems” and symbols that spontaneously arose across cultures and individuals. As Frey-Rohn quotes Jung,

‘I have often been asked where the archetype comes from and whether it is acquired or not. This question cannot be answered directly. Archetypes are...factors and motifs that arrange the psyche elements into certain images, characterized as archetypal, but in a way that they can be recognized only from the effects they produce. They exist preconsciously, and presumably they form the structural dominants of the psyche in general. They may be compared to the invisible presence of the crystal lattice in a saturated solution...Empirically considered, however, the archetype did not ever come into existence as a phenomenon of organic life, but entered into the picture with life itself.’<sup>105</sup>

Archetypes are “irrepresentable” in the same way that the quality of “dog-ness” (the generic concept that we hold in our minds) is not representable as the basic “formal” concept, but only in the endlessly varied images of actualized dogs. Or, as Rowland notes,

---

<sup>104</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 51–52.

<sup>105</sup> Liliane Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung: A Comparative Study of the Psychology of the Unconscious* (Boston: Shambhala, 2001), 97.

If we take an analogy with a vase, the general idea of a vase as a container may be inherited. Yet when a vase appears in a dream, its style, material, and specific contents will owe most to the dreamer's historical and actual encounters with vases and what fantasies they may arouse. Such archetype-inflected mental images are known as archetypal images: they are the fusion of the shaping power of the archetype with the life experience and preoccupations of the ego.<sup>106</sup>

A characteristic of archetypes that does not seem to be generally recognized by Jung's critics is, as Rowland describes, that they "are bipolar in that they contain their own opposites, so that the mother archetype can be manifested as a caring female form, yet will also be able to produce a devouring monster mother image: it all depends what the ego needs at the time." Not only that, but they are also androgynous.

As well as encompassing both genders, archetypes can represent themselves as good or evil, animal or human, divine or demonic, high or low. Their bipolar nature reflects Jung's intuition that the tension of the opposites underpins the psyche. He borrowed the Greek term, *enantiodromia*, to signify his view that everything eventually turns into its own opposite. If that is so, then archetypes must be continually re-imaging, or imagining the subjectivity of the conscious ego.<sup>107</sup>

Though Goldenberg interprets the psyche as being disembodied along with the archetypes, "Jung assumed the inseparability of body and psyche"<sup>108</sup> coined the term *psychoid* to describe the characteristic of the archetype as being both psychic yet also connected to matter.<sup>109</sup>

Jung reasoned that just as the instincts are grounded in the somatic processes of the neural system, the archetypes similarly possess a non-psychic 'psychoid' basis: 'If so, the position of the archetype would be located beyond the psychic sphere, analogous to the position of the physiological instinct, which is immediately rooted in the stuff of the organism and, with its psychoid nature, forms the bridge to matter in general.'<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>106</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 30. Another writer who has made significant contributions to a feminist understanding of archetypal theory is Roberta K. Rigsby and her article "Jungians, Archetypalists, and Fear of Feminism" in *Continuum*, vol. 3, 1994.

<sup>107</sup> Ibid.

<sup>108</sup> Estella Lauter and Carol Schreier Rupprecht, "Feminist Archetypal Theory: A Proposal," in *Feminist Archetypal Theory: Interdisciplinary Re-Visions of Jungian Thought*, ed. Estella Lauter and Carol Scheier Rupprecht (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 224.

<sup>109</sup> Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung*, 98.

<sup>110</sup> Charles R. Card, "The Archetypal View of C.G. Jung and Wolfgang Pauli," *Psychological Perspectives* 24, no. Spring-Summer 1991 (1991): 26.

## *Nazism and Anti-Semitism*

As to the charges that Jung was anti-Semitic and a Nazi sympathizer, Rowland concludes about “these unpleasant aspects of Jung’s work and career” that “there is evidence of culpable anti-Semitism and a morally flawed participation in Nazi culture...[yet] I do not believe that Jung was ‘a Nazi,’ a term that indicates unambiguous support for their policies.”<sup>111</sup> A helpful perspective comes from Gerhard Adler in an interview conducted by the Jung Institute of Los Angeles for the making of a documentary called “Remembering Jung.” In the interview, Adler, the Jewish co-editor of the entirety of Jung’s *Collected Works*, notes the close working relationships that Jung held with several other Jewish colleagues, including Aniela Jaffe, editor of Jung’s autobiography, Erich Neumann, James and Hilde Kirsch, Jolanda Jacobe, and Max Zeller. Adler insisted that he did not believe that Jung was anti-Semitic. The claim of Nazism, on the other hand, he describes as “more complicated.” At the start of the Nazi period, according to Adler, Jung was convinced that there was something happening on an archetypal level that could be of some value, and subsequently produced the *Wotan* essay for which he attracted much criticism. During this same period, Jung accepted the presidency of the International Society of Psychotherapy, an organization run by Germans, for which he was also criticized and perceived to be a Nazi sympathizer. Yet Adler notes Freud’s own support of Kaiser Wilhelm II during World War I and concludes that psychologists can be “unrealistic” about politics and political power. Later, when confronted by rabbi Leo Baeck, Jung admitted that he had “slipped up” regarding his *Wotan* essay.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 12.

<sup>112</sup> Suzanne Wagner, *Remembering Jung: Conversations About C. G. Jung and His Work*, DVD (Los Angeles: Bosustow Video Production, 1986).

## *Gender Essentialism and Misogyny*

Clearly, Jung was a man of his time, and displayed common thinking about women that is now considered misogynous but which was accepted in his era. It is true that he “tended to collapse gender identity into bodily sex” and expressed “essentialist views of innate femininity or masculinity.” On the other hand, Rowland sees this essentialism as “tempered significantly by the implications of the theory of anima and animus” and by “his explorations of the cultural shaping of the feminine in literature and religion. To put it at its most basic, the compensatory drive of the Jungian unconscious does not allow him to be as essentialist as he seems to wish.”<sup>113</sup> Despite his time-bound and limited perspectives on gender, Rowland claims that “Jung had some valuable thoughts about gender and the feminine, which were picked up by his profeminist successors.”

These ideas include the exploration of ‘the feminine’ in symbols and myths, proclaiming the presence of the feminine and masculine in each gender, protesting at the harm done to psyche and culture through repression of the feminine, and an insistence on full individuation for women in analytic practice. All this does not remove the stigma of Jung’s reductive and misogynistic language, [nor his] slippage of gender into biological sex and the equation of women, the feminine, Eros and diffuse consciousness.<sup>114</sup>

Rejecting a “fixed opposition between essentialism and social constructivism,” Rowland points out that “If ‘history’ is wholly determining on gender, then that too is an essentialist position; the essence shifts from biology to history.” Taking a deconstructive approach, she claims that the “innate essence/history binary on gender” still results in a “metaphysical residue” either in biology or history. “The relationship between archetypes and archetypal images,” she writes,

---

<sup>113</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 32.

<sup>114</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

provides another way by thinking through this binary archetypally. The metaphysical residue inherent in archetypes is a creative energy, not a fixed stamp of gender identity. Archetypal images are created in dialogue between biological inheritance and culture. As a metaphysical residue, archetypes remain radical, since they are also the irreducible unknowableness of the unconscious, making and undoing the ego's understanding of gender. By structuring gender as a creative dialogue with the unknowable, in which history and culture have a formative role, more radical and feminist versions of Jung can be glimpsed.<sup>115</sup>

Within this project, I do not address whether gender is a stable category. Instead, I assume all binaries to be dipolar and not bifurcated. I am interested in the value of Jungian thought as an “experiential and pragmatic means of aiding wounded [people]” and therefore see this work as feminist in nature.<sup>116</sup> A key point is that neither Whitehead nor Jung cast out and suppress “the other,” but see “the other” as crucial to life. Rowland notes that

Body cannot simply equal psychological gender if the psyche itself is gender fluid...Androgynous archetypes are multiple and have a compensatory role to ego experiences. The mind can never be of one fixed gender and archetypes will *work with* and produce *contrasting notions* of the femininity and masculinity witnessed in material culture. There cannot be an innate and stable gender identity, because once such a state was realized then one prime method of the archetypes in weaning the ego onto the better nourishment of the unknowable, unfixable unconscious would cease. Gender *has* to be a process.<sup>117</sup>...Jung's underlying psychology remains coherent if such crude essentialism is discarded.<sup>118</sup>

It is also helpful to note that whereas other psychiatrists and psychologists of his time saw “spontaneous unconscious fantasies” as “pathological,” Jung’s “unconscious was a meaningful, healing place.” The deep respect for unconscious processes he fostered was so strong that some of his own female patients, including Sabina Spielrein and Toni Wolff, moved through their illnesses and later became respected analysts. “Some of [Jung’s] reductive misogyny,” writes Rowland, “comes down to his adopting of Enlightenment notions of polarity

---

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 108.

<sup>116</sup> Ibid., 68.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid., 39–40.

<sup>118</sup> Ibid., 41.

represented in gender terms. Nevertheless, Jung has feminist credentials in wanting to put the feminine and the irrational (unconscious) back into both religion and philosophy.”<sup>119</sup>

### *Supporting the Status Quo*

While it is certainly legitimate to point to the tendency of religious symbol systems to uphold the status quo, it hardly makes sense to place that in the lap of Jung, a religious iconoclast if there was one. “[The modern person],” wrote Jung, “is a Bolshevik for whom all the spiritual standards and forms of the past have lost their validity, and who therefore wants to experiment in the world of the spirit as a Bolshevik experiments with economics.” For moderns, the scientific outlook cannot be reconciled to the religious outlook and “Christian tenets have lost their authority and psychological justification.”<sup>120</sup> The reason that religion no longer has the same hold on modern people, Jung felt, was because “traditional religious symbols no longer mediate the transcendent factors they once did; they are no longer alive.”<sup>121</sup> Both Jung and Whitehead understood their respective systems to be the best they could devise based on the empirical knowledge they acquired and observed but both equally encouraged—and even expected—revision of their thought. Both understood religion and culture to be malleable and in need of constant examination and revision, and both prized the roles of novelty and creativity in the transformation of individuals and societal systems.

In response to Jung’s critics, I have suggested that charges of mind-body dualism on the part of Jung are misplaced. At the same time, a synthesis with Whiteheadian thought in this area only strengthens even more the unity of mind and body. Critique of Jung’s archetypal theory

---

<sup>119</sup> Ibid., 61.

<sup>120</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 232.

<sup>121</sup> Stein, “Jung’s Green Christ,” 3.

seems to be based solely on Jung's early theorizing rather than upon his later distinction between the archetype and the archetypal image. Still, as will be explored in detail in Chapter 6, a synthesis of process thought and analytical psychology leads to an understanding of transpersonal reality as formal without being determinative. Jung's approach to Nazi Germany was certainly flawed, and that seems to have been acknowledged by him later. On the other hand, claims of anti-Semitism do not seem wholly legitimate based on Jung's close working relationships with—and professional encouragement of—several Jewish colleagues. His ideas on gender and sex are definitely flawed, and also timebound, as was the case with Whitehead. Finally, the criticism that Jung supported the status quo seems somewhat misplaced, as is evident when his views of religion are taken into account as well as his understanding of the cultural and contextual nature of archetypal images. We must acknowledge that while the archetypes themselves are not determinative (see Chapter 6), the images carry the weight of the historical past and are therefore compelling and authoritative. As a result, I strongly argue that criticisms of both men and their work should not prevent us from utilizing the rich resources that their thought provides.

## **LIMITATIONS AND PROJECT REQUIREMENTS**

We have explored resonances, contrasts, and critiques of Whitehead and Jung. As a project that seeks to reveal the value-soaked, relational, and transformational nature of both cosmic and psychic reality and articulate a praxis for realizing those characteristics while fostering psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing, this work will show that there are clear gifts that Whiteheadian and Jungian systems of thought bring to the table. Moreover, the well-established practice of using dream work (explored in detail in Chapter 5) for psychological growth also offers much. Yet each area also has its limitations.

As already discussed, Whiteheadian thought can be overly abstract and optimistic about the evolution of individual and social forms. To those limitations, Jungian thought brings imaginal depth, intimate empirical observation of human behavior, and a respect for the destructive forces of the unconscious and the ever-present potential within human nature for evil. Jungian thought describes a transpersonal archetypal reality and the possibility of numinous encounter with the “Other” at the depths of experience, but has no metaphysical framework that can show how such formalism can exist, why it is necessary, and that it is, in fact, possible to encounter God at the depths of experience. Whiteheadian thought describes an event-based reality where transformative and novel possibilities offered by God for actualization are available in every moment yet offers no practical method for discerning those divine aims, let alone aligning with them. Jung’s process of individuation can be understood, on the other hand, as a process through which one can distinctively embody novel possibilities through the archetypal Self’s guidance. Psychological and spiritual dream work enables individuals to begin to interpret the symbolic language of the unconscious and discern God’s aims; such a practice could be seen as operationalizing process thought as well, but its reach has been somewhat limited to those who can access and afford psychological analysis. Jung’s process of individuation furthered through a practice of dream work increases value, wholeness, and zest/enjoyment, but it has no philosophical or metaphysical framework to show how it facilitates real and healing encounters with the living God. Process thought, on the other hand, can provide dream work and the process of individuation a metaphysical-theological framework that shows a one-world reality, where God is immanent in the world and in the psyche, and makes coherent the whole system of the symbols of the Self, shows how there can be formal influence without determinism, how the pressure of the objective/historical past is real but that there is also freedom/choice, and how



Jung's transcendent function can be seen as God's novelty and creative transformation. Said another way, process thought has been overly conceptual, and needs the imaginal to make it more compelling and persuasive. Jungian thought needs the conceptual frame to show how it is coherent in a one-world reality, friendly to science, and not dependent upon a supernatural God. Dream work lacks a metaphysical-theological framework and needs to be democratized as a spiritual practice that is more readily and easily accessible.

Although Whitehead approached his topic "through the logical relations of abstract symbolic language" and "Jung's approach was based on his extensive practical experience exploring the images produced in the psyche," Maxwell sees both as "entirely valid ways of understanding the complexity of experience"; even more, he sees them as "highly complementary to the point of being necessary to one another for the sake of completeness."<sup>122</sup> When Cobb claims that what Jung imagines as *depth* is the same as what Whitehead imagines as *past*, he acknowledges the generative possibilities in synthesizing the two, noting that "if we all moved freely back and forth between images of depth and images of the temporal past, the power of our imagination would be enhanced."<sup>123</sup> Keller imagines there to be a "hidden connection" between these two systems that can only be accessed by undergoing "the underworld passage" where "the two quests cross."<sup>124</sup>

When in the textual aftermath of the living author the Jungian and the Whiteheadian schemes of insight begin to close in upon themselves, becoming monolithic models of scholarly or therapeutic ilk, it is the worldliness of psychology and the soulfulness of cosmology that erode. When by contrast we seek to know them together, do we do this sensing that the outer edges of Jung's psyche and the inner limits of Whitehead's cosmos meet? Is a rendezvous between world and soul possible, precisely where there reigns a multiply

---

<sup>122</sup> Maxwell, "Archetype and Eternal Object," 53.

<sup>123</sup> John B. Cobb Jr., "Eternal Objects and Archetypes: A Response to Stanley Hopper," in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 127.

<sup>124</sup> Keller, "Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection," 134.

institutionalized politic of disconnection? If so, we do not look for connection between Jung and Whitehead for its own sake or theirs, but rather for the sake of the ‘invisible connection’ of the world (which is in the soul) to the soul (which is in the world).<sup>125</sup>

We can afford to lose no more time in making this “underworld passage.” It might be that the very health of our people and our planet depends on it. In his concluding contribution to *The Archetypal Process*, James Hillman—having acknowledged his former pointed aversion to metaphysics—describes the deep change he experienced at a meeting in Cordoba where physicist David Bohm “admitted frankly and sadly that physics had released the world into its perishing.” Bohm recognized that “physicists had neither learning nor ability to think the world out of its peril—and that this job was not the job of the physicist anyway.” In recognizing that the plight of the world was “way beyond the discipline of the men who had advanced this plight, Hillman writes,

I saw the terrible need for metaphysics. The physical threat of the end of the world results from a metaphysical catastrophe...The critical tradition of seeing through, of perspectivalism, of metaphorical ambiguity, of relativism and desubstantiation—my *via negativa* in the vale of soul-making—is necessary but not sufficient. It is sufficient neither internally nor externally... The internal needs of the soul require that its psychology meet the soul's concerns about the nature of the cosmos in which it finds itself...Soul seeks to understand itself beyond itself; it attempts, in a strangely persistent and universal way, always to fantasy beyond; otherwise, would we have the many sciences and philosophies, the theories of origins and ends? This paranoid restlessness of the soul to be metaphysically satisfied by ultimates of meaning must be acknowledged as one of its internal needs.<sup>126</sup>

Even more is necessary. There are external needs gaping now that cannot be addressed through psychology. Hillman continues,

Externally, the soul is situated differently from any time since the Flood. There have often been apocalyptic expectations. But now extinction is a predictable possibility. We are at the edge of the Final Solution. Sure, the Turks were once at the Gates, and there was the Black Plague—but there could always be imagined a

---

<sup>125</sup> Ibid., 136.

<sup>126</sup> Hillman, “Back to Beyond: On Cosmology,” 215–16.

remnant, or another place to go. And at least the buildings and the trees would go on. Now, however, the bell tolls for the whole earth, and its catalogue of all and everything. If the *anima mundi*, the soul of the world, is in this unprecedented situation, then psychology must also speak to and from the soul in this situation. It struck me in Cordoba that what I had been doing was merely another strand of Western skepticism and nihilism. Worse: by declining to engage in metaphysics I was abetting the decline of the civilization into the catastrophe of concretized nihilism.<sup>127</sup>

We cannot decline to engage in metaphysics, and so we must supplement Jung with Whitehead. We cannot effect a change in the popular imagination with dry conceptual language alone, and so we must supplement Whitehead with Jung. We cannot achieve a transformation of consciousness through beautiful theoretical and empirical ideas alone, and so we must supplement Whitehead and Jung with an embodied, transformational praxis wherein one can encounter primordial, transpersonal Reality that shows us that *we matter*, that *we belong*, and that *we can experience positive change*.

## SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have introduced the claim that the process thought of Whitehead and the analytical psychology of Jung positively address the limitations and deleterious effects of a dualistic worldview, the fragmentary nature of human experience, the ability of humans to encounter a life-giving source of dynamism in their everyday lives, the inherent value of all beings and of diversity itself, the validity of non-sensory experience, and the relationship of mind to body. Even more importantly, both allow access to resources for positive change within everyday human experience that are transformative, liberative, and salvific. I have shown that their thought might be even more relevant today than it ever was, that their work may provide resources for common flourishing, and that a creative synthesis of the two systems is generative

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 216.

and offers new possibilities. By examining what I am calling resonances and contrasts between Whitehead and Jung as well as their critics and responses, I have prepared the ground for the next two chapters wherein I will introduce the foundations of Whiteheadian and Jungian thought to move us toward a compelling synthesis that (1) describes the depths of unconscious experience as the source of dynamism, value, and creative advance; (2) describes an integrated and relational reality that grounds both cosmos and psyche; and, (3) values multiplicity, diversity, and individual contributions of value.

Part I of this work has tackled the problem of fragmentation in American society, demonstrating how we are divided societally, interpersonally, and intrapersonally, and lays blame for the bulk of this painful reality at the feet of our divisive but dominant worldview. We explored how mind-body dualism and our dismissal of the nonrational and nonsensory has diminished human appreciation for what Jung called nondirected thinking and thereby limits our access to the vital resources of primordial experience and transpersonal reality. At the same time, we have examined how the losses of transpersonal projection and ritual may result in the rise of ego inflation and the severing of communal bonds, and raised the seeming inability of the Church to address such problems in a way that still has relevance for contemporary society. I have also shown that even if we could introduce more people to the better paradigmatic options that exist, such cognitive shifts are unlikely to effect any lasting change; no, only *an embodied transformational experience of wholeness* holds any hope for shifting human consciousness and behavior.

Positing, then, that such a goal requires the synthesis of theoretical, empirical, and practical resources, Chapter 2 has established why Whiteheadian and Jungian resources offer life-giving aspects that are still relevant and worth considering. In Part II, I will present each of

these resources in more detail: 1) the *theoretical* process thought of Alfred North Whitehead; 2) the *empirical* analytical psychology of Carl Gustav Jung; and, 3) the *practical* resources of dreaming and dream work.

Hoping to make a contribution—no matter how small—to the efforts to move us toward individual and planetary health and wholeness, I thereby offer the following pages of integration, synthesis, construction, and transformation. In the remainder of this work, after demonstrating the value of a framework that synthesizes Whiteheadian and Jungian thought, I will show that when such a framework is combined with a practice that connects mind and body, reveals the relationality at the base of experience, and raises unconscious experience to consciousness, the result can facilitate the transformation of human experience in liberative and salvific ways.

*Ultimately*, this project will show how a generative synthesize of these three strands of resources—theoretical, empirical, and practical—drawn from Whitehead, Jung, and dream research, allows the construction of: 1) a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*; 2) a theory of a *relational-imaginal God-Self in the human being*; and, 3) a transformative *relational-imaginal praxis for psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing*.

Let us turn now to Alfred North Whitehead and discover how his *philosophy of organism*—what later came to be called *process-relational philosophy* or *process thought*—describes an Integrated, Relational Cosmos.

PART II:  
INTEGRATION: THEORETICAL, EMPIRICAL, PRACTICAL

CHAPTER 3:  
THEORETICAL: AN INTEGRATED, RELATIONAL COSMOS

Deeply disturbing is the failure of rational people, who can see neither the chasm of evil nor the chasm of the holy, who with the best of intentions believe that with a little reason they can reunify a structure that is falling apart. In their lack of vision they want to do justice to both sides and are thus caught in the crossfire between clashing powers, without having accomplished the least bit.

—Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Ethics*

**INTRODUCTION**

Here in our journey, we begin Part II, which focuses on Integration. In Chapters 3 and 4, I will introduce the foundations of Whiteheadian and Jungian thought to move us toward a generative synthesis that (1) describes the depths of unconscious experience as the source of dynamism, value, and creative advance; (2) describes an integrated and relational reality that grounds both cosmos and psyche; and, (3) respects and fosters multiplicity, diversity, and individual contributions of value. In this chapter, we traverse the wounding and healing power of worldviews and the importance of what Whitehead was trying to accomplish, and then dive deeply into the ontological foundations of his philosophy of organism so that we may understand his one-world ontological theory and the process he conceived of as the way in which everything becomes and actualizes its instance of existence. Then we will unpack how the dead past and living immediacy are both part of the beginnings of experience, and how Whitehead conceptualized subjects, objects, perception, internal relations, and the relationship between mind and body. Finally, we will explore his descriptions of transpersonal reality and God, and

how multiplicity, flux, value, and transformation are inherently and unavoidably part of our world.

## **WORLDVIEWS: WOUNDING AND HEALING**

Can a worldview wound? Alternatively, can a worldview heal? There is little doubt that our thoughts both shape and are shaped by our experiences. In the same way that our “biography becomes our biology,”<sup>1</sup> our worldview becomes our world. In a damning opinion piece published online by *The Guardian*, George Monbiot blames neoliberalism for the “plagues of anxiety, stress, depression, social phobia, eating disorders, self-harm and loneliness” that “now strike people down all over the world.” Pointing to the negative effects of media—both broadcast and social—he notes that

There are plenty of secondary reasons for this distress, but it seems to me that the underlying cause is everywhere the same: human beings, the ultrasocial mammals, whose brains are wired to respond to other people, are being peeled apart. Economic and technological change play a major role, but so does ideology. Though our wellbeing is inextricably linked to the lives of others, everywhere we are told that we will prosper through competitive self-interest and extreme individualism.<sup>2</sup>

We are suffering. We are fragmented, and the proof lies in our politics, in our racism, in our pollution of the earth, in our loneliness and alienation from each other and from ourselves, and in the disconnection we feel from our own bodies. In many ways, this reality has come to be because of the story—the worldview—that we are telling ourselves. The main characters in that narrative include

---

<sup>1</sup> This is an idea that has been discussed by such authors in the self-help movement as Carolyn Myss and Donna Jackson Nakazawa.

<sup>2</sup> George Monbiot, “Neoliberalism Is Creating Loneliness. That’s What’s Wrenching Society Apart,” *The Guardian*, October 12, 2016, [https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/12/neoliberalism-creating-loneliness-wrenching-society-apart?CMP=share\\_btn\\_fb](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/12/neoliberalism-creating-loneliness-wrenching-society-apart?CMP=share_btn_fb).

- The *substance metaphysics* that tells us that the world is ultimately made up of dead, inert bits of “stuff” that is passively pushed around by causal forces beyond their control, displacing any sense of freedom or choice, leaving us impotent in the face of oppressive forces;
- The *dualism/materialism* that separates mind from body and fact from value, displacing all meaning and value from the world and placing it all within the atomistic self that has only external relations to other beings, thereby leaving us incredibly alone in an uncaring universe;
- The *mechanistic view of the world* that tells us not only that soul is separate from body, but that there is no such thing as soul, thereby displacing all sacredness and subjectivity from humans, animals, and the world itself, leaving us to despoil the planet for its resources and turning us from beings with dignity, integrity, and inherent value into consumers that exist solely to use and abuse whatever is at our disposal; and,
- The *patriarchal view* that preferences male over female, mind over body, rationality over feeling, *Logos* over *Eros*, and *power* over *relationship*.

Yet the characters in this dominant—and dominating—narrative cannot explain the very foundations of our existence: the way our minds and bodies interact, the purposive nature of our lives, the meaning that comes with relationship, the power of both aesthetic and non-sensory experiences, or even the relationship between the knower and the known. And yet, their scathing power still wreaks havoc on our human spirits and interpersonal bonds and brings us to the brink of ecological disaster.



## A Worldview for Wholeness

“The goal or ideal of metaphysical reflection,” writes Thomas Hosinski, “is to discover the structure of reality,”<sup>3</sup> to account for “the unity and systematic character of our experience, while at the same time doing justice to its multiple dimensions,”<sup>4</sup> or, as Roland Faber describes it, to show how “all spheres of reality, all levels of experiences, and all modes of cognition” are part of the same “coherent context” even while being “differentiated” and diverse. If so, then we might ask ourselves if the divisive worldview that has dominated Western culture is the only way we can approach and interpret the cosmos we inhabit.

Mary S. Poplin of Claremont Graduate University argues that there are four primary worldviews at work in the current global scene: naturalism, humanism, pantheism and Judeo-Christian theism.<sup>5</sup> In this project, I will argue that a process-relational worldview offers the most compelling resources for a project focused on wholeness and transformation. As Coleman notes, process thought “offers a description of reality as a whole, including atoms, amoebas, dolphins, humanity and God. More specifically, process theology explains the constant sense of change in the world and how we exist in the midst of stability and instability.”<sup>6</sup> Rather than giving us either the “Leibnizian rationalism of windowless monads [or] a billiard ball universe of blindly interacting, qualityless particles,” Whitehead offers “a metaphysic of the patterned intertwining of all things: a philosophy of organism.”<sup>7</sup>

For those who are theologically inclined, we have the additional task of showing how God interacts with and influences that “sphere of reality” within which humans find themselves.

---

<sup>3</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 43.

<sup>4</sup> Susan Shotliff Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects” (PhD, University of Texas at Austin, 1968), ix.

<sup>5</sup> Mary Poplin and Dallas Willard, *Is Reality Secular?: Testing the Assumptions of Four Global Worldviews* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2014), passim.

<sup>6</sup> Coleman, *Making a Way Out of No Way*, 45.

<sup>7</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 2.

In his book *The Shape of Practical Theology*, Ray S. Anderson relates a conversation he had early in his ministry with a congregant who told him that

[I]t was easy to agree to the omnipotence of God—that [God] could do everything—but what was of more immediate concern was whether God could do anything in particular. If it is important to know and believe that God is omnipresent—that [God] is everywhere present—one could readily assent, but what one really longed for was to discover God present in the small space of one’s personal life.<sup>8</sup>

Drawing from James E. Loder’s “transformation theory,” Eolene Boyd-MacMillan describes a movement of the human spirit in which it is transformed through encounter with God.<sup>9</sup> It is my own deep conviction that any theology that does not help people to experience transformative encounters with God is a worthless theology. Moreover, the only theology that will have living relevance for contemporary society in the United States is one that reflects the diversity, complexity, and depth present in human experience and offers something of value to that experience.

Worldviews, then, can either be wounding or healing, divisive or connective, nourishing or devouring. While neoliberalism may be the guilty “homewrecker” that breaks the social bonds necessary for the human animal’s flourishing, it is also imperative to recognize the deleterious effects of substance metaphysics, dualism, materialism, mechanism, and patriarchy. Few of us give any thought to the worldview that lies at the bedrock of our way of moving through the world, and even fewer of us spend our time reflecting on metaphysical philosophy. Yet if it is metaphysical reflection that helps us to discover the structure of reality, and offers a way to understand all of experience as having a coherent wholeness that still honors diversity, then *we*

---

<sup>8</sup> Ray S. Anderson, *The Shape of Practical Theology: Empowering Ministry with Theological Praxis* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2001), 12.

<sup>9</sup> Eolene Boyd-MacMillan, “Loder and Mystical Spirituality: Particularity, Universality, and Intelligence,” in *Redemptive Transformation in Practical Theology: Essays in Honor of James E. Loder Jr.*, ed. Dana R. Wright and John D. Kuentzel (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004), 385.

*cannot ignore metaphysics*. Theologically, we also cannot ignore the need for an understanding of how God interacts with our world. If a compelling worldview exists that can counter the dominant destructive narrative, then I pose that process metaphysics is an alternative worldview for wholeness. We can begin to understand this claim by grasping the ontological foundations of process thought.

## ONTOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

For a worldview to have any hope of healing our fragmentation through recognition of a coherent context of wholeness, then it must show how we are all part of one interrelated world where everything has value. This is true for process metaphysics wherein there is no “going behind” actual entities for anything that is “more real” and there are no “supernatural” causes that “float into the world from nowhere.”<sup>10</sup> As Faber explains, “Whitehead’s project was to reestablish the unity between the sundered spheres of experience and reality,”<sup>11</sup> a “volatile” perspective that is the source of both its “theological attractiveness and the hostility directed toward it.” He writes,

(a) *All* experience—including religious experience and theological thought—is to be accounted for in its *inner integrity*. (b) *Every* experience—one’s personal veneration of God no less than scientific knowledge—is to be coherently comprehensible within the *same* context as the *one* unified world. (c) *No* experience may be understood beyond the *mutual transition* from matter to mind, subjectivity to objectivity, knowledge to reality. (d) *Nothing* isolated from experience can be real; in the larger sense, nothing isolated ‘in and of itself’ is to be viewed as real.<sup>12</sup>

Whitehead’s ontological principle states that “no reason (in a metaphysical explanation) is acceptable unless it can be referred somehow to something actual” and so we “must appeal only

---

<sup>10</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 20.

<sup>11</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 22.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

to actual things that are experienced.”<sup>13</sup> His cosmology describes one reality that is inherently relational where all things have value and wherein God is an actual entity that is immanently encounterable within embodied experience. Because actualized reality is always in the process of becoming, the individual entity can choose in every moment what it will become, and therefore, no matter how painful one’s past or present, one has the capacity—within possibilities that are relevant to one’s immediate reality—to move forward in a way that is novel and positive. In this one reality, God seeks to lure every entity toward its highest enjoyment and greatest intensity of experience, and so, again, no matter what one has experienced in one’s past, every moment is afresh with possibilities that can lead toward more wholeness, more enjoyment, more zest for life, and more harmony and peace.

Within this one reality, Whitehead describes four principles at work: 1) the *spatio-temporal process* of forming and perishing entities; 2) *eternal objects*, or possibilities available to be actualized; 3) *God*, the dipolar entity that envisions value, offers relevant possibilities in the form of eternal objects, and receives the actions of the world, holding them in divine memory and responding with compassionate and redemptive love; and 4) *creativity*,<sup>14</sup> the active principle that answers the question of “why”—*why there is anything at all* rather than nothing.”<sup>15</sup> Anil Kumar Sarkar describes this as “a continuity of *objective immortalities* or an emergence of *possible forms* in the midst of other possible forms. What is suggested here is not a world of *static existence*, but a world of *possible existence*—existence by continuous elimination of the possibles.”<sup>16</sup> Lest we imagine all of this to be a strictly linear reality, Sarkar describes the way the four principles continuously dance between perishing and abiding:

---

<sup>13</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 20.

<sup>14</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, iii.

<sup>15</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 76.

<sup>16</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, iii.

Of the four principles, spatio-temporal process may be looked upon as a continuously perishing character, but it is abiding also. The eternal objects may be looked upon as abiding in contrast to the perishing spatio-temporal processes, but they are perishing processes in contrast to the process of God; God, in turn, may certainly appear as abiding, in contrast to both the spatio-temporal process and eternal objects, but this basic or primordial character of God is always contrasted with its consequent and superject characters (or aspects), which, again are perishing processes in contrast to the abiding function of creativity; the abiding function of creativity, lies in its process from the forms to the formless.<sup>17</sup>

Heraclitus famously noted that “one cannot step into the same stream twice.” Likewise, in Whitehead’s philosophy of organism, the empirical truth that there is no such thing as a static river becomes the basis of his cosmology. Reality, instead, is an adventure where dynamic creativity is always at work, spontaneously forming momentary unities that then perish and become “efficacious influences”<sup>18</sup> on the next momentary unity that is forming. Within the process framework, notes Carol Christ, “the whole universe is alive and changing, continually co-creating new possibilities of life... For process philosophy, change, freedom or creativity, and embodiment are interconnected. Everything in the world is in process. Change most definitely is.”<sup>19</sup> Although the facts of the past are indeed “stubborn,”<sup>20</sup> relevant possibilities for novel futures are always given, and in this way, neither novelty nor order have the final word.

Reality, then, is ultimately characterized in three ways: (1) as *relational*, meaning that “there are no isolated realities, only transitions from multiplicity to unities”; (2) as *concreting*, meaning that in every moment of experience a “plural reality” of actualized facts is unified in a “growing together” of “a new unity that integrates all its relationships”; and (3) as *creative*,

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

<sup>18</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 76.

<sup>19</sup> Christ, *She Who Changes*, 45.

<sup>20</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, xiv.

meaning that reality as a “moving whole” is always “a process of processes” that emerges, integrates, and perishes, adding to the plurality of actualized facts.<sup>21</sup>

### Whitehead’s Ontological Theory

There are many reasons why Whiteheadian thought provides such rich resources for a project that seeks to foster transformation, but the primary reason is due to Whitehead’s prioritization of *experience*. In his *ontological theory*, Whitehead hypothesized that the basic way “occasions of experience” form is the same whether that occasion is human, animal, vegetable, or mineral, although higher order beings or “societies” do experience more complex phases within the same basic process. His metaphysics emerged directly from “an analysis of the common experience of human subjects.”<sup>22</sup> For him, it is not just that the full richness of human experience must always be taken into consideration within any metaphysical system’s explanation of the structure of reality, but that human experience is a lens through which we may view and learn about the *entire universe*. In fact, for Whitehead, theory is always “secondary” to the experience that is, in fact, its “final test.”<sup>23</sup> As Norman Pittenger writes,

Whitehead was convinced that the only way to make intelligible the meaning or significance which we naturally take for granted in our ordinary moments is to relate our concrete experience as a human being to the mystery of the dynamic evolutionary process that is going on around us *and in us*. Human existence is indeed distinctive, yet it is not separated from everything else. It has its own qualities and capabilities, but these are not without analogues elsewhere. *We belong to the world that has produced us*. Hence, anything that deepens self-awareness contributes to our knowledge of that world, and anything that increases our knowledge of the world contributes to our self-understanding.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 23–24.

<sup>22</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 43.

<sup>23</sup> Coleman, *Making a Way Out of No Way*, 79.

<sup>24</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 10–11.

If we pause to examine our everyday, human experience, what do we know to be true? As a human, I experience myself as an individual who has a history, who makes decisions, who envisions a future with various options, who reacts and responds to innumerable stimuli that I encounter in my world—both physically encountered elements and mentally encountered thoughts and images—who connects with other human and non-human beings on a daily basis, and who can sometimes make changes in my behavior when presented with persuasive alternatives. In each moment, I experience myself as a subject in the present, but in many ways, “the present is the child of the past.”<sup>25</sup> As Hosinski notes, there is a “ground of connectedness and continuity in our experience. Experience flows from the objective world of the past to the experiencing subject of the present.” Yet while there is a definite “givenness” of the past, we also know that each of us is a unique individual with goals and purposes.

We are each unique centers of feeling, needing, desiring, willing, hoping and dreaming... We experience drives toward freshness and novelty of experience. We act with purposes and intentions born in the privacy of our hearts, minds, and wills... We cherish and cultivate what we value; we despise and resist what we detest; and we accept, endure, or ignore the rest with varying intensities of feeling. In short, our experience as subjects is not only what we receive from the world, it is also something new that arises within us—something, at least partially, of our own creation.<sup>26</sup>

Whitehead asserts that “The conduct of human affairs is entirely dominated by our recognition of foresight determining purpose, and purpose issuing in conduct.”<sup>27</sup> “Purposes,” argues Hosinski, “aim at the realization or enhancement of some value.” If, as subjects, we actually do experience value, then such a reality requires that present subjects have “entertained the values inherent in the actual situation from which we began; that we have also entertained the values in possible alternatives, unrealized potentialities, or ideals; and that we have compared or

---

<sup>25</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 73–74.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 74.

<sup>27</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *The Function of Reason* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1958), 13.

contrasted these latter values with those present in the actual situation from which we began.”<sup>28</sup>

In other words, the dynamic structure of human experience rests upon four presuppositions: (1) that there truly are various possibilities, *real alternatives*, open to us in every moment; (2) that we experience those alternatives as having or not having *value* to us in the present; (3) that we *select* from the alternatives before us based on that value; and (4) that individual subjects actually possess the *freedom to choose* from among real alternatives.<sup>29</sup>

One of the most controversial and theologically-rich aspects of Whitehead’s metaphysics is his proposal that every occasion of actualized existence has “a subjective character. That is, each occasion is a center of becoming; it has a subjective unity and is active in the process of its self-construction.”<sup>30</sup> Whitehead is in agreement with modern physics which also seems to propose that “All the ‘final real facts’ which constitute actuality are not to be thought of as substances but as occasions of experience.”<sup>31</sup> In recent decades, science has shown that reality is not, in fact, made up of tiny billiard balls of “stuff” being bounced around by external causal forces as has generally been imagined for centuries. Christ notes that both Whitehead and his student Charles Hartshorne “disagreed with scientific materialism’s view that the universe is made up of dead matter that acts and reacts according to predetermined laws...[neither was] content to consider human freedom an exception to the general rule that everything (else) acts according to predetermined laws.” She continues,

They both felt that scientists were right to desire a unified understanding of all reality in which the same principles could be used to understand the behavior of all individuals in the universe. Against the theory that all matter is ‘dead,’ Whitehead and Hartshorne made the (from some perspectives) astonishing proposal that all matter is in some sense ‘alive.’ Whitehead argued that all individuals down to the smallest particle of an atom have the ability to ‘feel’ and

---

<sup>28</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 75.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 75–76.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*



to ‘feel the feelings of others.’ In order to avoid the impression that he was attributing humanlike consciousness and feelings to all individuals down to the particles of an atom, Whitehead preferred to use the technical term ‘prehension’ rather than the word ‘feeling’ to describe this activity.”<sup>32</sup>

Hartshorne went so far as to describe a *panpsychic* reality wherein all parts of nature experienced “feeling or sentience” to one degree or another, even if that experience was negligible.<sup>33</sup> Before dismissing this notion as “a groundless and speculative flight of anthropomorphic fantasy”<sup>34</sup> we might reflect upon the results of a 2007 study at the University of California at Berkeley on photosynthesis and the behavior of electrons in green sulfur bacteria. Writing in *Chemistry World* for the United Kingdom’s Royal Society of Chemistry, Philip Ball reports that Graham Fleming and his team proved that the energy of botanical photosynthesis is “smeared out over many electronic states in a quantum superposition, in effect being in many different states at once.” To discover the path of least resistance while in these states, excited electrons “sample” the available routes.<sup>35</sup> Lynne McTaggart, a journalist and lecturer who bridges science and spirituality, writes of the same study that in their attempt to understand the “ruthless efficiency” of photosynthesis, Fleming and his associates stumbled upon “a giant chink in the entire edifice of accepted biology.” She describes the experiment in this way:

Fleming’s experiment takes a tiny fraction of the time it takes to blink an eyelid. As soon as the pulsed light from the lasers hits the protein, it excites—and thus dislocates—electrons, which then need to find the most direct route along their tiny protein scaffolding ‘track’ to the reaction centers. This is a complex and potentially time-consuming task, according to conventional physics, as there are many possible pathways and endpoints that the electron would have to seek out and eliminate, one by one...Rather than a single pathway, the electrons reach their target by trying out several routes simultaneously. Only when the final connection is made and the end of the road reached does the electron track its most efficient path retroactively and the energy follow that single path. It appears as if the

---

<sup>32</sup> Christ, *She Who Changes*, 55.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 58.

<sup>35</sup> Philip Ball, “Photosynthesis Works by ‘Quantum Computing,’” *Chemistry World*, May 1, 2007, <https://www.chemistryworld.com/news/photosynthesis-works-by-quantum-computing/1013803.article>.

optimum route were chosen backwards in time—after all possibilities had been exhausted...Fleming's discovery is a wholly unexpected answer to his line of inquiry: the plant is so efficient because its messenger electrons are able to occupy more than one location at the same time.<sup>36</sup>

Not only are the electrons in green sulfur bacteria occupying more than one location at a time, they appear to be exploring and evaluating multiple alternative pathways simultaneously and then choosing which one to pursue.

### **The Process of Concrecence**

To understand the creative advance of both bacteria and humans, then, we must dive into the details of Whitehead's hypothesized process of concrecence—the process by which anything actual comes into being or the way in which “the ‘fluidity’ of becoming [‘hardens’] into being.”<sup>37</sup> The creativity of the cosmos can provide the ground from which things spring and the fact that they do spring in the first place, but Whitehead shows how entities obtain their specific qualities and what it is that sets limits on those specifications so that there is not completely random chaos at work. He does this through his process of *objectification*, a “relationship between actual entities in which the development of one is in some sense dependent upon the other.”<sup>38</sup> Within that process, entities are dependent upon other entities in their immediate past as well as upon God for their formation; God is the initiating factor in every moment of experience.

Here it is important to note that Whitehead imagined every occasion to be *dipolar* in nature; entities have a *physical* pole through which they experience other actual entities from their immediate past in an *objective* way along with a *mental* pole, through which they experience *conceptual* possibilities for the future as well as qualitative or aesthetic value.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Lynne McTaggart, “Quantum Plants,” accessed October 1, 2016, <http://www.lynnemctaggart.com/blog/375-hello>.

<sup>37</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 46.

<sup>38</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects,” 59.

<sup>39</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 84.

Because there is both “determinateness” that enters each forming entity from the actual world in its “physical inheritance”<sup>40</sup> and “indeterminateness” that comes due to the nature of conceptual possibilities and values or “the basic operations of mentality,”<sup>41</sup> Whitehead describes the world as “bipolar” or “dipolar.” Unlike the dualistic bifurcation of the mental and the physical in a Cartesian worldview, Whitehead’s dipolar aspects are like the opposite poles of a battery or magnet; they are necessarily together. It is through this polarity that “novel determinateness of feeling” enters into the actual world.<sup>42</sup> He writes that “The actual entity on its physical side is composed of its determinate feelings of its actual world, and on its mental side is originated by its conceptual appetitions.”<sup>43</sup> Whitehead continues,

The integration of the physical and mental side into a unity of experience is a self-formation which is a process of concrescence, and which by the principle of objective immortality characterizes the creativity which transcends it. So though mentality is non-spatial, mentality is always a reaction from, and integration with, physical experience which is spatial.<sup>44</sup>

We can think of the process by which entities form as having distinct phases while, in fact, Whitehead believed that such distinctions were an abstraction from both the actual simultaneity of the phases and their continuity with previous and future occasions of experience. For purposes of explanation only, the basic core process can be understood as having three phases: an *initial (receptive)* phase, a *responsive* phase, and an *integrative* phase<sup>45</sup>; higher order occasions (such as sensate living organisms) also experience supplemental phases, which will be discussed later.

---

<sup>40</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 108.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 33.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

<sup>45</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 59ff.

### *The Initial (Receptive) Phase*

The very first thing that initiates the formation of an entity or moment of experience is that entity's *initial aim*—this is its thrust at being, its urge to make of itself something actual, its living dynamism of creativity that kick starts it into existence. As the concreting subject progresses, it claims that initial aim as its own *subjective aim*, using it to fuel its own self-creation. Its urge to make some possibility *actual* is what Whitehead called the occasion's *subjective aim at satisfaction*. According to Hosinski, "This can be understood most simply as the existence of a 'drive' in each occasion to make something of and for itself."<sup>46</sup> Here, it is important to note that

[Whitehead's metaphysical system] does not claim, with metaphysical arrogance, to explain concrete uniqueness. The infinite fullness of such experience is always supreme over thought, and perhaps no systematic metaphysician has ever insisted on this truth more strongly than Whitehead. Thus what Whitehead claims in this interpretation is only to show why and how such concrete uniqueness is possible, how it is that this undeniable uniqueness arises in our experience.<sup>47</sup>

The *initial stage* of the aim is "an endowment which the subject inherits from the inevitable ordering of things, conceptually realized in the nature of God." The initial aim is the very "immediacy" that constitutes the entity's "living aim at its own self-constitution." In any moment, the initial aim is the best and most relevant possibility for the conditions that exist, but even though that highest possibility is envisioned by God, it is not determined by God, because, ultimately, each entity chooses what it will become. Whitehead notes the potentially tragic consequences: "The initial aim is best for that *impasse*. But if the best be bad, then the ruthlessness of God can be personified as Ate, the goddess of mischief. The chaff is burnt."<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 84.

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>48</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 244.

In this initial phase, forming subjects of experience do not experience a context-free vision for possibility; they are bound and limited by the actual facts of their immediate past. Those factual realities are experienced *objectively*. In his cosmology, Whitehead “[brings] human experience into continuity with the occasions of the natural world”<sup>49</sup> and shows how “experience flows from the objective world of the past to the experiencing subject of the present.”<sup>50</sup> The initial phase of an occasion of experience is most reflective of the statement that “the present is the child of the past,” because it is in this phase where the past is given as an “inheritance” or as “objective fact” and also actively “received” by the moment that is forming. Here, “*something* is passing from the past to the present.” To indicate the active nature of such receiving, Whitehead terms it *prehension*, “from the Latin *prehendere*, which means to seize or grasp.”<sup>51</sup> Les Muray understands the term “to prehend” as being related to the psychological term “to internalize.”<sup>52</sup> If the process ended with this initial phase, there would be no change, evolution, or growth, only repetition of the past. We know there is more—that we respond to what is given, that we imagine hopeful futures, and that we can choose to move toward those imagined futures in novel ways. It is therefore in the *responsive* and *integrative* phases of concrescence that novelty and uniqueness come into play.

### *The Responsive Phase: Possibilities and Purposes*

In the initial phase of concrescence we see how the objective past flows into the present moment, and how the forming moment grasps or prehends the past. While the past is already a *fait accompli*, when forming in the present a momentary event can either repeat, or conform to,

---

<sup>49</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 67.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 73.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 59.

<sup>52</sup> Leslie A. Muray, *An Introduction to the Process Understanding of Science, Society and the Self: A Philosophy for Modern Humanity*, vol. 26, Symposium Series (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 6.

its past, or it can entertain other possibilities. While the past is prehended physically, Whitehead argued that potentials are entertained in the mental pole of each occasion due to the fact that “possibilities and values are not ‘physical’ actual entities”<sup>53</sup>; therefore, such possibilities are experienced as *conceptual prehensions*.<sup>54</sup> Yet the forming moment must be grasping *something real*, some object or datum being perceived as possibility or value; Whitehead referred to these conceptually prehended objects as *eternal objects*.

### *Eternal Objects*

For Whitehead, the ultimacy of *creativity* explains “*that* things are” and eternal objects explain “*what* things are” because they are the “infinite hierarchy”<sup>55</sup> of ingredients in every actuality that characterize it.<sup>56</sup> Mattingly considers the doctrine of eternal objects to be “central” to Whitehead’s metaphysics<sup>57</sup> because it explains the “definite nature” of entities, the “definite relationships among individuals” and the “recurring patterns of a qualified, spatio-temporal world.”<sup>58</sup> They are formal elements that function both objectively and subjectively: as *objective*, they are “forms of dynamic, extensive relationships” and as *subjective*, they are forms of feelings” and it is the oscillation between them that “rhythmically” advances the creative process.<sup>59</sup> They are both *real* potentials and *pure* potentials<sup>60</sup>; they are *real* in that they can be conceptualized before being actualized, and they are *pure* because they “bear no ‘necessary reference to any definite actual entity of the temporal world.’”<sup>61</sup> We see this clearly when we

---

<sup>53</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 84.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>55</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” x.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 163.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, vi.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 171.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, x, 103.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

<sup>61</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 66.

think of the color blue or the number two. “Blueness” or “twoness” can be observed in specific, actual things that display the color or quantity but we can also think of “blueness” or “twoness” in a general way that is not limited to any of the instances in which we observe it.

[E]very actual entity is what it is because it is definitely one thing rather than another. All actual entities have forms of definiteness. Every ‘drop of experience,’ therefore, involves eternal objects. The eternal objects are objects, therefore, of experience. Yet eternal objects are not actual—they are purely potential. How then can they explain reality, since to search for a reason is to search for one or more actual entities? Yet without eternal objects, there is no room for the appearance of the really ‘New’ in concrete actuality—there would be only the already actual to draw upon and to arrange and rearrange.<sup>62</sup>

Eternal objects are conceptual “because of their special features of being operative as possible goals (subjective aims) in all levels of cosmic processes”;<sup>63</sup> they are “indifferent to any temporal exemplifications.”<sup>64</sup> Eternal objects *transcend* all individual occasions and are only *actualized* in individual occasions of experience; at the same time, occasions of experience reflect, embody—and participate in—the eternal by actualizing such potentials. It is critical to remember that in Whitehead’s “one world,” eternal objects are not any kind of ideal “ultimate reality” but are “abstractions within the process and possibilities for that process. They are real solely in events and event nexuses.”<sup>65</sup> Because an eternal object can be “realized in many events” given the right conditions, they transcend “the singularity of every event.” They are not the “essence” of events; rather, they “make it possible for events to become what their ‘essence’ is.”<sup>66</sup>

Eternal objects are envisaged within the actual entity of God. They cannot coerce anything into being—in and of themselves they possess no causal force—but depend upon real

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>63</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 29–30.

<sup>64</sup> Edward G. Ballard, “Kant and Whitehead, and the Philosophy of Mathematics,” in *Studies in Whitehead’s Philosophy*, vol. 10, Tulane Studies in Philosophy (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1961), 13.

<sup>65</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 86.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 87.

entities for embodiment.<sup>67</sup> They are the “timeless ground of the actual world” that must be “grounded in an event” because “the infinite potential of all possibilities must not only be present within it in its timelessness, that event must also be that *eternal unity of presence/present* that is never within time and yet is the unconditional ground of the arising of all time and all presence within time.”<sup>68</sup> Eternal objects are “eternal” partly because they are inexhaustible, unable to be “‘used up’ in any one spatio-temporal appearance” yet those individual appearances are bound by certain limits.<sup>69</sup> Mattingly notes that

The same form may be the form of any number of entities, as the same melody may be played by any number of instruments or the same equation expressed by any number of symbols. Whitehead makes this point by saying that eternal objects transcend the actual entities in which they are involved, that they are essentially indeterminate as regards to their ingression into particular actual occasions, and that they are abstract...<sup>70</sup>

Odin describes eternal objects as “abstract value-patterns,” “aesthetic value-patterns,” and as “basic organizational patterns” that initiate every occasion.<sup>71</sup> Lee understands them to be God’s “envisagement of the structure of possibility” and describes the universe as “reasonably together” due to the fact that there are “patterns of assemblage” that are demanded by “the creative advance of the universe” because order is required in each actual entity and grouping of entities.<sup>72</sup> At the same time, Whitehead writes that eternal objects “in any one of their modes of subjective ingression are then functioning in the guise of subjective novelty meeting the objective datum from the past.”<sup>73</sup> Here again, it is critical to remember that neither the order nor

---

<sup>67</sup> Ballard, “Kant and Whitehead,” 13.

<sup>68</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 87.

<sup>69</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 100.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.

<sup>71</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 167–68.

<sup>72</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 62, 89.

<sup>73</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 164.



the novelty is determined ahead of time by God; “each act of becoming is a free act” that arises *with* the moment itself “as a result of which the texture of reality is modified.”<sup>74</sup>

How are eternal objects communicated to forming moments of experience? Whitehead believed that eternal objects *ingress*—or enter—into occasions through the internal presence of other entities—either past entities or God. As Ballard describes it, “the subject may feel or ‘absorb’ another actual entity, as in the case of physical causation or perception,” or “it may include or absorb an eternal object”<sup>75</sup> directly through its mental pole as a conceptual prehension of God’s initial subjective aim for that occasion. The objects perceived by forming subjects—whether they are physical objects of the past or conceptual objects of potential futures—are *qualitative* elements with “complex location,” meaning that they are “shared by the datum and by the percipient event.” They are what Mattingly refers to as, “extensively relational” because they “cannot be divested of their spatial and temporal reference.”<sup>76</sup> Said more simply, the same “blueness” or “twoness” is present in the object being perceived, the eye that’s capturing the sense data, and in the mind that is interpreting the sense data as having those qualities. Eternal objects are also partially responsible for the fact that we experience permanence in the world because the same form or eternal object is present in “successive actual entities in the same manner or mode.” While often compared with Plato’s *Ideas*, Krauss argues that eternal objects “are not inert forms waiting to be appropriated” but “have the unrest of the Platonic Eros” and act as persuasive “lures for feeling.”<sup>77</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 89.

<sup>75</sup> Ballard, “Kant and Whitehead,” 15.

<sup>76</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 64.

<sup>77</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 47.

Eternal objects function in a relational<sup>78</sup> way, determining both the datum and what Whitehead calls the *subjective form*—the emotion and purpose—of what is prehended.<sup>79</sup> Prehended objects, then, carry feeling. When a feeling has the “datum” of an eternal object, it is known as a “conceptual feeling” and it is then a determinant of the character of the concreting entity.<sup>80</sup> Subjective forms are the “how” of any prehension and the subjective forms of conceptual prehensions are a *valuation*, or “emotional or aesthetic reactions to the worth or value of these eternal objects by the subject prehending them...at the moment of concrescence.”<sup>81</sup> The responsive phase is also marked by what Whitehead termed *appetition*, meaning an urge or drive to form a subjective experience, to “realize in the present a particular form of definiteness” that is unique to that subject.<sup>82</sup>

### *The Integrative and Supplemental Phases*

The third stage of concrescence—the final stage for most simple occasions of experience—is what is known as the *integrative* phase; here, “the subject integrates the conceptual feelings of its second phase with the physical feelings of its first phase.”<sup>83</sup> At this point, the subject reaches the determination of its subjective aim in its final “decision.” Its purpose is complete, and it has reached its “terminal phase,” that of “satisfaction.” Sadly, the satisfied subject cannot linger in any golden haze of glory, but immediately perishes and becomes objective data—what Whitehead called a *superject*—to be prehended by future forming occasions.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 164.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 33, 70.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 240.

<sup>81</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 86.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 87.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 89.

Whitehead invented the word ‘superject,’ which literally means ‘thrown beyond.’ He means that by making a decision in the present moment, each actual entity is also ‘throwing itself’ beyond the present into the future: it is making itself into what the immediate future moment must receive. In this way the present moment lives on into the future, but only as an object, drained of its subjective immediacy. Whitehead also refers to this as the ‘*objective immortality*’ of actual entities.<sup>85</sup>

In more complex organisms, Whitehead imagined that experience did not terminate at the end of the integrative phase as it does with simpler occasions. Rather, he proposed that experience could progress to include what he called *propositions*, *propositional feelings*, and *intellectual feelings*. These supplemental phases produce another object that may be grasped, or prehended, by the subjective center of experience. Such a datum he calls a “metaphysical proposition” and its purpose is to “lure” the concrescing occasion to ‘feel’ it; that is, the primary purpose of metaphysical propositions is not to express truth or falsehood, but rather to influence the concrescence of actual entities.”<sup>86</sup> “Feeling,” “emotion” and “purpose” are important to the process of concretion, and that which is a “datum for feeling has a unity as *felt*.”<sup>87</sup> Whitehead stresses the importance of feeling when he writes that “It is an essential doctrine in the philosophy of organism that the primary function of a proposition is to be relevant as a lure for feeling...The ‘subjective aim,’ which controls the becoming of a subject, is that subject feeling a proposition with the subjective form of purpose to realize it in that process of self-creation.”<sup>88</sup> In most “low grade” occasions, Hosinski explains, the integrative phase forms what is called a “comparative feeling,” where the eternal object or possibility is integrated with the definitive facts of physical prehensions, but that occasion “never has the time, so to speak, to feel its integration as a proposition” nor is any real novelty possible for such entities.<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Ibid.

<sup>86</sup> Ibid., 100.

<sup>87</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 24.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>89</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 106.

Whitehead hypothesized that conformal feeling in the initial receptive phase of every occasion of experience is the ground of our experience of continuity and connectedness. It is how things endure, how the past lives on in the present, how there is continuity in the world. But if this is the case, how can anything new come into the world? How is novelty possible? There must be some other factor or set of factors operative which makes it possible for there to be diverse sorts of things in the world, factors operating so as to produce the diversity and novelty which is so familiar to us in our common experience.<sup>90</sup>

Novelty begins to be possible only for “higher level” occasions, yet metaphysical propositions can be “felt” even by occasions that do not possess consciousness or language; this occurs at what we may identify as an *affective* or unconscious level—prior to any rational judgment—where the occasion is acting “on the basis of an emotional appetite for value.”<sup>91</sup> We can understand this more clearly when we think of our own reaction to especially beautiful artistic expressions. Whitehead reminded us that the audience of Hamlet’s soliloquy is reacting not to the truth or falsehood of “to be or not to be” but to its emotional and tragic sublimity.<sup>92</sup> Propositions are a kind of “hybrid” entity “between pure potentialities and actualities”<sup>93</sup> because

[E]ternal objects do not tell us how they are present in the actual world. They speak only of totally abstract possibility, telling no tales of what in fact is. On the other hand, actual entities in themselves do not tell us what is possible. They speak only of concrete fact, telling tales only of what in fact has been...Propositions are hybrid entities: they mix the potentiality of eternal objects with the limiting conditions of actual entities and thus introduce a new kind of datum for feeling.<sup>94</sup>

Propositions are *relational*, in that they are present in both past and forming occasions who share the same “actual world”; if a proposition conforms to the actual world of the concrescing occasion, it is considered “true.” Yet it is only those propositions that *do not* conform to the concrescing occasion’s actual world—those considered “false”—that make

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., 81.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., 101.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 102.

<sup>93</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 185–86.

<sup>94</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 106–7.

novelty possible. True propositions that successfully lure an occasion to actualize them result only in repetition; yet with a false proposition, “[a] novelty has emerged into creation. The novelty may promote or destroy order; it may be good or bad. But it is new, a new type of individual, and not merely a new intensity of individual feeling.”<sup>95</sup> To paraphrase Hosinski, the proposition “I have written a dissertation for my doctoral program” as I am writing that sentence is false. But entertaining this proposition—and the emotional valuation, or subjective form, that accompanies it—has lured me through years of hard work at Claremont School of Theology.<sup>96</sup>

As already discussed, metaphysical propositions do not require rational judgment or consciousness to be entertained, and so the process of concretion can yet include another “sub-phase” in which metaphysical propositions are raised to the level that Whitehead called *intellectual feelings*. A *propositional feeling* is felt as “the contrast between a possibility (the predicate) and a fact (the ‘logical subject’ of the proposition)” and it is integrated unconsciously according to its affective value or attractiveness for the concreting subject.<sup>97</sup> When an occasion of experience becomes *aware* of the contrast between “what is mere possibility and what is actual fact,” what is evoked is an *intellectual feeling*; “the contrast between fact and theory is known as well as felt.”<sup>98</sup> Although Hosinski cautions us that this kind of knowledge is not yet *rational*, “the knowledge produced by conscious intellectual feelings is the data which initiates reflective or rational thought. It constitutes the ‘conscious experience’ which reason seeks to plumb more deeply and to understand more fully.”<sup>99</sup> Within this world, then, we are assured that

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 108–9.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 108.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 111.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 121.

when we sense meaning and significance in our experience it is reflective of a reality within which meaning and experience *are possible*. As Pittinger writes,

[P]rocess thought is concerned with analyzing human experience at its deepest and widest, never being content with regarding that experience abstractly but always intent on its concrete disclosure to us of what it means and what it feels like to be human—to be human in a world that is both the origin of and the setting for human existence with its distinctive qualities and capacities.<sup>100</sup>

Here we have seen the radical alternative that process metaphysics offers to the dominant dualistic and mechanistic worldview and its disregard for the nonrational. Whitehead's system explains the nature of reality as one coherent context that does not require interventions by a transcendent, supernatural God; moreover, it does not narrow human experience to exclude freedom, purpose, and value. In this section, I have described Whitehead's ontological theory and the process of concrescence. We have seen how everything in existence has internal relations to everything else; even more importantly, I have shown how Whitehead's cosmos is inherently relational, value-seeking, and how dipolar entities experience the world both through mentality and through feeling. Now let us return to the very beginnings of experience and the way in which Whitehead integrates the presence of the dead, factual past with the living immediacy and possibility of the present moment.

## **THE BEGINNINGS OF EXPERIENCE: DEAD PAST AND LIVING IMMEDIACY**

For Whitehead, the very beginning of the process of *concrescence*—the formation of actualized events—is marked by the internal appropriation or *prehension* of both the objective past—the entire *actual world*—and of the *living immediacy* of the present moment that ingresses as God's initial subjective aim. Both are prehended through the mode of perception that

---

<sup>100</sup> Pittinger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 25.

Whitehead termed *causal efficacy* (discussed later in more detail) and therefore enter physically and unconsciously into the new occasion. Whitehead's use of the term *prehension* is important, as it implies *internal relations* between the subject and its world.<sup>101</sup> Every occasion is both subjective and objective—subjective as it is concrescing, but then perishing into objective fact and becoming a superjective datum for the next concrescing moment. This is the inexorable flow of process. To wit, Hosinski raises an important question:

If subjectivity 'perishes' in 'decision,' then how does the *living immediacy* of subjective experience begin? The 'living' subjective present cannot originate from the 'dead' objective past. The past objective world, though necessary as the ground upon which present subjectivity 'stands,' offers no reason for the living immediacy of the present moment. Nor can that living immediacy simply appear 'out of the blue.'<sup>102</sup>

"Living immediacy" arises when the subject "grasps its subjectivity for itself by prehending God," by "feeling God's conceptual feelings," by encountering God directly within itself.<sup>103</sup> In this process, God and the objective past are encountered at the base of the process of concretion as "Other" and Steve Odin links this to Jung's description of the "depth-dimension" of our own experience, or what Jung named "the archetypal imagination."

When wholly demythologized, the dipolar God-in-process as the collective unconscious is simply the creative act of imaginative experiential synthesis itself, which combines antecedent plurality into a new unity, whereas the primordial nature is its aspect as the archetypal imagination, which provides normative aesthetic-value patterns functioning to organize the manifold of causal feelings into harmonic contrasts, thus producing maximum depth of emotional intensity in each occasion of experience.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>101</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 18.

<sup>102</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 159.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., 174.

<sup>104</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 171.

## Subjects, Objects, and Perception

Descartes concluded that “I think, therefore I am.” John Locke, Griffin notes, pressed for a “mechanical philosophy” in which “nature was to be understood as devoid of all properties except those quantitative features necessary for mechanistic interactions;” any other aesthetic or purposive qualities were located in the human soul and projected onto the natural world.<sup>105</sup> More recently, materialistic logical positivists jettisoned value and creativity from both nature and human, because, as Robertson points out, they “confined all questions about the ultimate nature of reality to the dust heap of non-sense: literally not sensible, since they did not refer directly or indirectly to sensory perception. Their attitude was that if questions are too bothersome to fit into a theory, just define them away as non-questions.”<sup>106</sup> Such mechanistic-materialistic thinking “runs through our culture, fed and absorbed with our first nourishment, and so generally accepted, so obvious that few people ever question it,” writes Kelsey. “[T]he idea that mind might act directly upon matter, or that a spiritual (a nonphysical) reality might break through and change something seems unthinkable.”<sup>107</sup> In this milieu, Hosinski notes, “Christian claims for revelation and religious experience seemed to lose all meaning.”<sup>108</sup> Such a view makes problematic the very existence of an objective world.<sup>109</sup>

Within the past century, the mechanistic view of nature and classical Newtonian physics have very nearly collapsed entirely but our cultural worldview has yet to catch up to the new insights that are coming out of the sciences. Pittinger points to “quantum physics, the principle of indeterminacy, relativity theory, and the like” as being “instrumental in bringing about this

---

<sup>105</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 240.

<sup>106</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 133.

<sup>107</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 71–72.

<sup>108</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 228.

<sup>109</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 241.



change.”<sup>110</sup> Rather than the objectivity in the world arising from our subjectivity, in an event-based world it seems that our subjectivity emerges from the immediate past of the objective world. As Whitehead notes, “For Kant, the world emerges from the subject; for the philosophy of organism, the subject emerges from the world.”<sup>111</sup> Therefore, to understand the order, novelty, and “perpetual perishing” at work in the world, we must understand the relationship between subjects and objects. We know that a concrescing subject internalizes prehended objects—both physical and mental—in its initial and responsive phases, but Mattingly points out that “if prehending subjects and prehended objects form exclusive sets of entities” that are unrelated, “the ‘solidarity of the universe’ will not be achieved”<sup>112</sup> and there would be no interconnected web to which we can belong. We can be held in such a relational web only if “every prehended object is also a prehending subject and every prehending subject is also a prehended object.”

Mattingly continues,

The problem is to understand how a subject, an entity with its own intrinsic nature, a being ‘in itself,’ can be an object for another subject, can be ‘for others.’ How must we revise our traditional concepts to explain how an actual entity enters into the very constitution of another so as to condition its identity without thereby losing its own identity?<sup>113</sup>

Our understanding of perception arises from our epistemology, or theory of knowledge, and key to our theory of knowledge is our explanation of how the knower is related to what is known. Hosinski captures the fundamental problem when he writes that

If we hold that all knowledge must be based in experience (as the main stream of modern epistemology has held), then the resolution of this problem must begin with an understanding of experience...Modern epistemology, since Hume and Kant, has had a great deal of difficulty in showing that there is any relationship between the knower and the known...[if] a philosophy cannot tell us how it is

---

<sup>110</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 35.

<sup>111</sup> Donald W. Sherburne, ed., *A Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 852.

<sup>112</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects,” 58.

<sup>113</sup> *Ibid.*, 59.

possible for us to know, then obviously there must be a major flaw somewhere in its approach.<sup>114</sup>

For Whitehead, the “ontological ground of the possibility of knowledge”<sup>115</sup> lies in the “genuine relatedness of given elements in experience” and in the ability for subjects to internalize and appropriate *for* themselves other entities that are, in fact, distinct *from* themselves.<sup>116</sup> As Mattingly notes, he “is primarily concerned in his discussion of perception to explain how it is that actual things beyond ourselves can enter into our experience.”<sup>117</sup> Our common sense experience tells us that any moment of experience begins with an objective world that is given, yet theorists like Kant and Hume contradicted our actual experience by insisting that “subjective experience at its most basic level begins with an instance of sense perception.”<sup>118</sup> This approach, Griffin maintains, cannot explain our “deep sense of sacred value as deriving from our perception of the values incarnate in other things, for it could not even portray us as perceiving other things!”<sup>119</sup> Whitehead’s empirical move was to abandon the “traditional interpretation of perception as a grasp of the properties of ‘things’ and moving toward a view of its being an apprehension of relations: of things *in* their relations and *as* related.”<sup>120</sup>

We live as a culmination of inheritances both of our past physical conditions and of our past personal history; our sense of unity with our bodily conditions and our immediate past, Whitehead argues, are instances of non-sensuous perception.<sup>121</sup> He agreed with David Hume that our sense perceptions and the things themselves are not one and the same, but Whitehead

---

<sup>114</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 118–19.

<sup>115</sup> *Ibid.*, 119.

<sup>116</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 53.

<sup>117</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>118</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 119.

<sup>119</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 241.

<sup>120</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 4.

<sup>121</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 66.

proposes that our ordinary experience insists that there must be two modes of perception: *presentational immediacy* and *causal efficacy*. What we typically think of when we refer to “sense perception” is what Whitehead calls *presentational immediacy* because this mode of perception “appears to present to us the contemporary world in its relations to our standpoint” yet, as Hosinski notes, what our brains interpret as contemporary is actually the state of the world “a few split seconds ago.”<sup>122</sup> What is being perceived in the present is actually our “‘feeling the body as functioning.’ This is a feeling of the world in the past; it is the feeling of derived feelings.”<sup>123</sup> “Sense perception,” Loomer argues, “is an abstract version of physical experience.”<sup>124</sup>

That physical, non-sensory perception of the past world is what Whitehead referred to as perception in the mode of *causal efficacy*. It is this mode of perception that is being utilized when forming entitiesprehend or internalize objective data. In other words, our ability to perceive what enters our experience through our senses depends entirely “on the prior functioning of the body...What we call our sensations, in other words, are the feelings we inherit from the interconnected chains of bodily experiences, transmitted to the present experiencing occasion in our brain that we call ourselves...”<sup>125</sup> This is a “more primitive mode of perception,” and it is a “direct grasping of another thing as causally efficacious for oneself.” This solves the problem Griffin defined earlier, because it is in this mode of perception that *value* is transferred, and it is in this mode that we “directly perceive real things and the relations, or transitions, between them.”<sup>126</sup> Our experience is made up of physical occasions that are spatial in nature—

---

<sup>122</sup> Ibid., 49.

<sup>123</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 81.

<sup>124</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 24.

<sup>125</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 51–52.

<sup>126</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 241.

the functioning of the body—and mental occasions that are non-spatial—our conscious acknowledgement of what is being perceived and its meaning for us—and those two are *essentially related* or correspondent to each other.<sup>127</sup> In fact, it is not just that the physical object of the blue chair is related to the blue chair in my mind, but that “blueness” and “chairness” are also related *to each other within the chair itself*. It is because of this relation that I can understand a blue chair to not only be a color that I can continue to see in the future, but is also a piece of furniture that I can sit upon.<sup>128</sup>

The activity of relating the data given in the mode of presentational immediacy to that given in the mode of causal efficacy is what Whitehead called *symbolic reference*. Sensory images, Griffin notes, in and of themselves “give us no information about other actual things, about causal efficacy, about aim, about intrinsic value (self-enjoyment), or about the communication of values...”<sup>129</sup> Yet those are all real aspects of our experience. What Whitehead’s theory of perception does for us is both show that I am directly related to the world of my experience, that the world of my experience carries its own value, and that human experience, at its deepest level, is experienced non-sensuously and non-rationally. Causation, as explained by Whitehead, is a relationship contained in the data themselves and those relationships are *directly perceived aesthetically*. As Hosinski instructs, “Causation, most primitively, is not a notion of a relationship of past to present produced by the subject reflecting upon the data of sense, but is directly perceived in the data of causal efficacy. It is, in short, experienced before it is reflected upon.”<sup>130</sup> Whitehead’s theory invites us into a world where

---

<sup>127</sup> Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, 90, 102.

<sup>128</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 55.

<sup>129</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 242.

<sup>130</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 70.

“feeling, emotion, [and] aim” are primary; a world in which “the human soul [is] fully a part of nature.”<sup>131</sup>

## Relations

One of the reasons that process thought is considered *relational* is because it describes an interdependent reality wherein actual entities are formed internally by their relationships to others. Yes, each entity enjoys freedom to decide what it will ultimately become—what value it will attain—but an entity’s process of concrescence is never fully *sui generis*. Every subjective entity (1) is initiated by God’s incarnation of God’s self as that entity’s “living immediacy”<sup>132</sup> and initial aim—the reason the entity’s self-causation begins;<sup>133</sup> (2) emerges from the objects it prehends—or internalizes—in its initial phase; (3) prehends physical data from the objective past and conceptual data in the form of eternal objects; and (4) upon its satisfaction, becomes an objective datum that is available to be internalized, and will therefore be related to, subsequently forming entities in its future world. No entity, society of occasions, or individual can claim that it is entirely self-made or that it stands independent of the rest of the world. Such a concept is ludicrous.

Process thinkers describe the universe as “intersubjective”<sup>134</sup> or an “inter-locked community,”<sup>135</sup> a “universal web of interconnected events,”<sup>136</sup> and “an ever-renewing relational

---

<sup>131</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 244.

<sup>132</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 174.

<sup>133</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 244.

<sup>134</sup> Joseph A. Bracken, *The One in the Many: A Contemporary Reconstruction of the God-World Relationship* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001), 4.

<sup>135</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 62.

<sup>136</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 41.

process.”<sup>137</sup> This web is understood as “generally enduring”<sup>138</sup> or “reasonably together” with “patterns of assemblage”,<sup>139</sup> yet Loomer notes that while our world appears to be “self-sufficient,” that appearance “enshrouds the unfathomable or inexhaustible mystery inherent within the factuality of the world.”<sup>140</sup> Drawing from Lucas, Faber states that it is an even more “provocative” aspect of Whitehead’s philosophy that “subjectivity and objectivity, mind and matter, cognition and being must be viewed as being *essentially* the same.”<sup>141</sup> Although this sets up the possibility for subjectivity and objectivity to simply be collapsed into monism, Whitehead avoids this by describing reality as a “dynamic rhythm of transition” that moves from object to subject to object in an “ecological unity” that is both “unitextural” and “irreducibly pluralistic” in its differentiation; this “moving whole” is in “perpetual creative transition from multiplicity to unity.”<sup>142</sup>

“We are dependent,” writes Pittenger. “We do not explain ourselves, we cannot keep ourselves in existence, we require that which is not ourselves in order to become ourselves.”<sup>143</sup> Of course, we each depend on food, family, shelter, and other “proximate realities” that we interact with daily; but on the deepest level, we depend “always and everywhere upon the creative and sustaining power of the basic reality working in and through the whole creation.”<sup>144</sup> “To pretend that we are independent,” he continues, “is stupid; it is also vainglorious nonsense.”<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> C. Robert Mesle, *Process-Relational Philosophy: An Introduction to Alfred North Whitehead* (West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2008), 3.

<sup>138</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 41.

<sup>139</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 62.

<sup>140</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 25.

<sup>141</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 22.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>143</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 143.

<sup>144</sup> *Ibid.*, 144.

<sup>145</sup> *Ibid.*

## Unified Body and Mind

The independent, atomistic self lauded in the Enlightenment was also viewed as a thinking, rational mind that unfortunately was saddled with a body, but those two were quite different in quality and quite separate. The separation of body and mind that characterizes the philosophical systems derived from Descartes is an “arbitrary disconnection”<sup>146</sup> that Whitehead thought of as “disastrous,”<sup>147</sup> “incoherent,”<sup>148</sup> and a “tremendous fraud.”<sup>149</sup> If body and mind are two different substances that have no internal relationship to each other, then how can Descartes claim any unity between his “I” and his body that is “seated by the fire” or between his bodily “hands and feet” and his mental perception that they are “mine”?<sup>150</sup> On what basis can we claim the unity with our bodies that is so central to our human experience? While the Scholastic view of Thomas Aquinas describes the mind as informing the body, Whitehead reminds us that “all the life in the body is the life of the individual cells...So what needs to be explained is not dissociation of personality but unifying control” or the sense of a “presiding personality.”<sup>151</sup> The physical body is a “complex living society” that supports the very existence of the “human person” who is “the strand of ‘presiding’ or directing occasions;” rather than being distinct, Whitehead saw these as in constant “interplay.”<sup>152</sup> The obvious fact that my body continues to perpetuate itself and the sense of unity I have with my own past indicates that there is a persistent “route of occasions” that gives me my specific character and individuality.

---

<sup>146</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 6.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 246.

<sup>148</sup> *Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>149</sup> A. H. Johnson, *Whitehead's Theory of Reality* (New York: Dover Publications, 1962), 76.

<sup>150</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 75.

<sup>151</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

<sup>152</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 138.

In process thought, no experience can be dismissed as “merely” subjective because that very subjectivity is itself a clue to the nature of the whole of reality. In the philosophy of organism, mind and matter are not two distinct substances and humans are not spiritual beings deposited in an alien biosystem from which they must escape to be “saved.” Subjects and objects are not in opposite corners with only external relations, and Whitehead jettisons substance metaphysics in one sentence when he writes that “the energetic activity considered in physics is the emotional intensity entertained in life.”<sup>153</sup> Pittenger elaborates on this important sentence:

What did Whitehead intend by these cryptic words? Essentially, that in a world such as ours, with creatures such as we feel ourselves to be in our moments of sensitive awareness, there is an intimate linkage between the thrust of human existence toward the achievement of goals and the creative movement of the cosmic order in its evolutionary drive. In other words, life—and above all humanly experienced life—belongs to and is part of the natural world. Life—and above all human life—cannot be rightly understood apart from that natural world. Neither can the natural world be rightly understood apart from life and above all human life. That life of ours is part of the cosmic process, and the ground of the cosmic process is thereby disclosed in some fashion in what human experience tells us. Conversely, at the same time, the cosmic process from which we have emerged and in which we exist cannot be properly grasped and described unless that experience is taken as a significant clue to what is really going on.<sup>154</sup>

In other words, we must not create a “false disjunction” between our emotional and physical selves, or between humans and nature. We should recognize instead that “we belong in and to the world...that has produced us” and that we can therefore embrace a “unified world view” that makes possible “a coherent and consistent grasp of life *and* of nature, of human life *and* of the world.”<sup>155</sup>

From Whitehead’s theory on how entities form in the process of concrescence, we learn that from successive occasions emerges the unity of an event, and from successive events

---

<sup>153</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Modes of Thought* (New York: The Free Press, 1968), 232.

<sup>154</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 9.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 10.



emerges the unity of a society of occasions. But how do we understand the personal unity of the self? Moreover, how do we understand the unity we experience between that mental self and the physical body that supports it if both are made up of continuously emerging and perishing “drops of experience”? Loomer attributes our assumptions of an enduring self that secondarily experiences the flux of embodied experience to the substantialist tradition in philosophy and theology.<sup>156</sup> Yet, this notion that there is a “more real” substratum that undergirds experience dashes any hopes of an integrated cosmos. Instead, Whitehead argues that there is nothing more real than actual occasions and that “events do not occur to something that is not itself an event, an occasion of experience is not an incident in the life of a self who is not an occasion. The self is its occasion, and the enduring person is a historic route of such occasions.”<sup>157</sup>

My self-identity is a “special strand of unity within the general unity of nature. It is a locus within the whole, marked out by its own peculiarities...” yet it reflects the same “general principle which guides the constitution of the whole”; this is the “object-to-subject structure of experience” or the “vector-structure of nature” wherein the past “energizes” in the present.<sup>158</sup> Whitehead’s cosmology describes an “overarching scheme of relational possibility” in which actual entities or occasions of experience “particularize the extensive continuum, rupture it, specify its generality from their perspective.”<sup>159</sup> Yet, as Sarkar reminds us,

From this observation, it is clear that process and emergence, physicality and mentality, quantitative processes and qualitative variety, govern and characterize the whole universe. From this many-sided approach to experience in evolution, Whitehead urges that none of the aspects of the changing universe can be determined specifically; every experiential situation is relational, directive, and multi-dimensional.<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 29.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid.

<sup>158</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 187–88.

<sup>159</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 59–60.

<sup>160</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 15.

Every occasion, therefore, has its own perspective and experience while being in relation to the whole interconnected matrix of events. My momentary present “ruptures” the extensive continuum from a particular perspective and my historic route of successive perspectives give me my sense of self-identity. As Hosinski notes, “My life history is *my* special locus of inheritance within the wider locus of space-time.”<sup>161</sup>

Yet it is not only our rational or cognitive experience to which we must pay attention, for in every moment, any human subject “is inheriting bodily feelings and his or her immediately past occasions of experience.”<sup>162</sup> For Mesle, “the mind/soul/self/psyche is the flow of the body’s experience or feeling” and it is not the “fleeting moments of reasoning” that make up the bulk of our experience.<sup>163</sup> In fact, moments of reasoning are relatively rare in the world; the majority of experiencers in the natural world swim mostly in that “great ocean” that is the “flow of felt emotion” on which “the thin layer of rationality precariously floats.”<sup>164</sup> As humans, we experience our bodily feelings and past occasions in a way that is unified—as in the way that my brain joins the images it produces to the physical sensations that my eyes and nervous system generate in my capacity for vision. As noted by Hosinski,

[W]e, as perceiving subjects, have bodies, and our sense perception is entirely dependent on the prior functioning of our bodies. We are directly aware that we see ‘with our eyes,’ hear ‘with our ears,’ feel ‘with our hands,’ and so on. These are vague feelings, but in them we are directly aware that our sense perception does depend entirely on the prior functioning of the body. Unless I first have the vaguely-felt experience of a properly functioning eye, I will experience no visual sense data. Only *because* I have a properly functioning eye are there visual sense data in my experience. Moreover, Whitehead points out, we know from experiments in physiology that a person can be made to have delusive sense

---

<sup>161</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 65.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, 44.

<sup>163</sup> Mesle, *Process-Relational Philosophy*, 23.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.*

perceptions simply by making her or his body function internally by various methods (drugs, electrical currents, etc.).<sup>165</sup>

Our sense experience reflects the unity of self and body, yet our body “inherits physical conditions from the physical environment according to physical laws”<sup>166</sup> and lies “in the field of nature” in a way that is “distinct from our personal existence.” The body “is part of the external world continuous with it,” argues Whitehead.

In fact, it is just as much a part of nature as anything else there—a river, or a mountain, or a cloud. Also, if we are fussily exact, we cannot define where a body begins and where external nature ends...And yet our feeling of bodily unity is a primary experience. It is an experience so habitual and so completely a matter of course that we rarely mention it. No one ever says, Here I am and I have brought my body with me.<sup>167</sup>

We know that we experience an “interplay” between the “innumerable inheritances” that have been physically generated by the functioning of our nervous system, our visceral and circulatory systems, etc., as well as the “emotions, hopes, fears, inhibitions, sense-perceptions” that arise from our body and our cognitive functioning.<sup>168</sup> As Hosinski describes it, “The body is that portion of nature with which each moment of human experience intimately cooperates.”<sup>169</sup>

Whitehead writes,

We cannot determine with what molecules the brain begins and the rest of the body ends. Further, we cannot tell with what molecules the body ends and the external world begins. The truth is that the brain is continuous with the body, and the body is continuous with the rest of the natural world<sup>170</sup>... the animal body does not differ in principle from the rest of the past actual world; but it does differ in an intimacy of association by reason of which its spatial and temporal connections obtain some definition in the experience of the subject. What is vague for the rest of the world has detained some additional measure of distinctness for

---

<sup>165</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 51.

<sup>166</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 189.

<sup>167</sup> Whitehead, *Modes of Thought*, 21, 114.

<sup>168</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 189.

<sup>169</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 43.

<sup>170</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 225.

the bodily organs. But, in principle, it would be equally true to say, ‘The actual world is mine.’<sup>171</sup>

Cobb and Griffin reference the same idea as expressed in even more “striking rhetoric” by Pierre

Teilhard de Chardin in his book *Science and Christ*:

Hitherto, the prevailing view has been that the body (that is to say, the matter that is communicably attached to each soul) is a *fragment* of the universe—a piece *completely detached* from the rest and handed over to a spirit that informs it. In future, we shall say that the Body is the very Universality of things, in as much as they are centred on an animating Spirit, in as much as they influence that Spirit - and are themselves influenced and sustained by it...My own body is not these cells or those cells that *belong exclusively* to me: it is *what*, in these cells *and* in the rest of the world, feels my influence and reacts against me. *My matter* is not a *part* of the universe that I possess *totaliter*: it is the *totality* of the Universe possessed by me *partialiter*.<sup>172</sup>

Whitehead embraces the dominant scientific view that our conclusions about the living body must be based on what we know to be true about other, non-living aspects of the physical world and then radicalizes it by insisting that the reverse must also then be true. In other words, we must also draw our conclusions about the rest of the physical world based on what we know to be true about the human body.<sup>173</sup> What we know about the human body is that there is an intimate interplay between the physical and the mental and between the objective past and the subjective present. Bruce Epperly reminds us that although they “differ quantitatively in terms of richness, complexity and novelty of experience,” mind and body “are similar in kind...the notion of unfeeling matter is an abstraction, the result of the apparent stability of physical objects.”<sup>174</sup>

Anytime we isolate something in nature for examination, we focus our perception on the “foreground” item in relief against a now diffuse “background” of the environmental

---

<sup>171</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 75–76.

<sup>172</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 115.

<sup>173</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 43.

<sup>174</sup> Bruce G. Epperly, “Process Theology and the Healing Adventure: Reflections on Spirituality and Medicine,” in *Handbook of Process Theology*, ed. Donna Bowman and Jay McDaniel (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006), 95.

relationships within which that thing exists. Theologian-turned-philosopher Alan Watts uses the example that we cannot fully describe a human being walking without referring to the ground or spatial location within which that activity is occurring.<sup>175</sup> The perception that the thing being studied exists independently of the web of relationships it is typically enmeshed in is termed by Faber a “process of substantiation” that reverses “the relationships attendant on the original perception” causing us “to view the reference framework now merely as the attribute of independent things and to view those now as the *substrate* of all relationships.” This bifurcation of bodily nature and mind is a “fundamental error” because “it views that which appears within thought (causal particles void of relation) as concrete nature.”<sup>176</sup> Robertson agrees that consciously separating ourselves from the unity of the world so as to study that world is an “artificial distinction”, a “game” that we have been playing since the Renaissance of, for example, pretending the hands attached to our bodies actually belong to someone else.

But it is still just a game; your hands remain connected to your arms, which are in turn connected to the trunk of your body. Your body remains a single, unbroken entity despite the fact that you can observe part of it separately.<sup>177</sup>

To be actual is to be embodied and embedded. According to Christ, Hartshorne believed that without bodies we would be “just gibberish” and that the mind and the body “are an irreducible continuum.” She claims that “Hartshorne’s perspective might also be called ‘pansomatism,’ the view that everything has a body, for the body is the location of feeling.”<sup>178</sup> Similarly, Epperly refers to our cosmos as “psychosomatic” and “panexperiential” because “[m]ind and body interpenetrate one another.”<sup>179</sup> Mind and body are not dualistically separate

---

<sup>175</sup> Alan W. Watts, *The Tao of Philosophy*, audiocassette (Electronic University Publishing, 1995).

<sup>176</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 46–47.

<sup>177</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 230.

<sup>178</sup> Christ, *She Who Changes*, 56.

<sup>179</sup> Epperly, “Process Theology and the Healing Adventure,” 95.

but are “dynamically interconnected” with mind “constantly shap[ing] the body even as the body continuously conditions the mind.”<sup>180</sup>

In this section, I have shown how a small but significant change to one part of our existence—the way we view perception—can create seismic shifts that ripple out aftershocks in all directions of the human experience and radically change the way we understand our relationships with everything in our world, from the deeply intimate experience of our own bodies to our inner experience of God. Now we will move from the most intimate workings of each entity’s inner experience to the way that we encounter transpersonal reality, the nature of God, and the necessary role that Whitehead understands God to play in the cosmos.

### **TRANSPERSONAL REALITY:**

#### **DIPOLAR GOD, MUTUAL IMMANENCE, AND NOVELTY**

The presence of value, belonging, possibility, and choice at the foundation of human experience is crucial to any metaphysical and *practical* theology that seeks to offer transformative potential to humans suffering from the crippling effects of adverse childhood experience or any of the other myriad negative aspects of embodied life. Equally important is to see in our moment-to-moment experience where and how we encounter God—understood by most religious traditions as the primordial mystery at the base of all life—and how we can discern the best from among the many alternatives available to us. These aspects of life must either be universally available to all persons equally—as a *transpersonal reality*—or it is meaningless to speak about them at all. We have already examined how the loss of transpersonal projection can cause individuals to identify too closely with the powerful, unconscious energies

---

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

of life, resulting in ego inflation and disconnection. As well, it is from this transpersonal reality that truly novel possibilities for actualization are offered.

In process thought, unlike in some classical Christian thought, the future does not yet exist; it has not already been determined in advance by God. As Mesle muses, “We are all on the verge of falling forward into nothingness; but, in each moment, the world becomes anew, and the creative advance continues.”<sup>181</sup> The creative advance within our “ecological universe of moving relationships,”<sup>182</sup> is characterized in three ways: (1) as *creativity*, or the “pure happening” of becoming and perishing; (2) as the *sphere of forms*, or the “pure longing for the unrealized and toward that which is new”; and (3) as *God*, that “concrete event within the process of processes” which “integrates creativity and forms.”<sup>183</sup> In the philosophy of organism, God is necessary, dipolar, and mutually immanent with, and available to, the world in every moment.

### A Dipolar God

God, like every entity in the philosophy of organism, is dipolar—both creative and responsive<sup>184</sup>—with a mental and a physical pole, or what Whitehead calls God’s *primordial nature* and *consequent nature*. God’s *primordial nature* is *transcendent* in that it is “nontemporal, eternal, and thus ‘out of time,’ transcending the temporal world while being essential for the processes of the temporal world.”<sup>185</sup> It is also “infinite,” “free,” “conceptual,” and “unconscious.” For Whitehead, God as primordial is “the unlimited conceptual realization of the absolute wealth of potentiality” and is “not *before* all creation, but *with* all creation.”<sup>186</sup> For Lee,

---

<sup>181</sup> Mesle, *Process-Relational Philosophy*, 5.

<sup>182</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 24.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid.

<sup>184</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 60.

<sup>185</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 176.

<sup>186</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 343.

it is God's primordial nature that "maintains the availability of the world's potentiality."<sup>187</sup> As primordial, God is the "lure for feeling, the eternal urge of desire"<sup>188</sup> or the "Cosmic Lover" who comes to the world as a "luring, attracting, enticing, inviting, soliciting" presence that "persuasively but not coercively" demands a response of love from creation.<sup>189</sup>

As God's primordial nature is only conceptual, it is therefore "deficiently actual," and if that were all there was to God, then God would be a "truncated subject, not a fully developed one."<sup>190</sup> Yet God also possesses a *consequent* nature that is "temporal," "determined," "actual," "physical" and "conscious." Here, God *receives the world* and transforms it;<sup>191</sup> here, "the love of the World passes into the love of God, and floods back again in to the World. In this sense, God is the great companion, the fellow-sufferer who understands."<sup>192</sup> As consequent, God "shapes the world process into a harmony in which the process itself is incorporated as the harvest."<sup>193</sup>

Whitehead poetically writes,

The consequent nature of God is his judgment on the world. He saves the world as it passes into the immediacy of his own life. It is the judgment of a tenderness which loses nothing that can be saved. It is also the judgment of a wisdom which uses what in the temporal world is mere wreckage...God's role is not the combat of productive force with productive force, of destructive force with destructive force; it lies in the patient operation of the overpowering rationality of his conceptual harmonization. He does not create the world, he saves it: or, more accurately, he is the poet of the world, with tender patience leading it by his vision of truth, beauty, and goodness.<sup>194</sup>

There is a dialectical relationship of contrasts between God and the world wherein "God's primordial unity acquires multiplicity in God's consequent nature, and the world's multiplicity

---

<sup>187</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 66.

<sup>188</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 344.

<sup>189</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 6.

<sup>190</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 187–88.

<sup>191</sup> *Ibid.*, 201.

<sup>192</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead's Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 71.

<sup>193</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 15.

<sup>194</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 346.



acquires a consequent unity in God.”<sup>195</sup> Moreover, God prehends the physical world from which each subject will emerge and then makes available in an ordered way possibilities that specifically fit that subject and its contemporary world.<sup>196</sup> In God’s own process of concrescence, God conceptually offers possibilities, physically prehends and *feels* the world, is aware of the contrast between propositions and facts, weaves “God’s physical feelings upon [God’s] primordial concepts,”<sup>197</sup> and returns possibilities to the world again. It is here where the value that the world has achieved is preserved<sup>198</sup> and held eternally in God’s memory.

### A Necessary God

For Pittenger, it seems to just be a “part of the human makeup” to yearn for “a reference beyond self and nature that will makes sense of our immediate experience” and to possess “a sense of the transcendent, unexhausted in our immediacies...mysteriously beckoning us toward ultimacies.”<sup>199</sup> For millennia, humans have called this transcendent referent God. Cobb defines God as “*a unitary actuality which is supremely worthy of worship and/or commitment*” and notes that atheism denies any such unitary actuality.<sup>200</sup> Whitehead, Pittenger, and other process thinkers understand this reality as encounterable within embodied experience but not coercive:

But if the ‘energetic activity’ in the cosmos is indeed disclosed to us in the ‘emotional intensity’ of lived experience, if the way things go is determined by some agency that does not occasionally interfere but rather ‘makes things make themselves’...if this is the case, then the reality and value of the secular can be preserved while at the same time the deepest religious insight with respect to the ‘more,’ the ‘transcendent,’ ‘ultimate concern,’ and a ‘reference beyond oneself’

---

<sup>195</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 64.

<sup>196</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 153.

<sup>197</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 345.

<sup>198</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 50.

<sup>199</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 14–15.

<sup>200</sup> Cobb Jr., *God and the World*, 20.

can also be given due recognition. Above all, we may come to understand cosmic ‘refreshment and companionship.’<sup>201</sup>

Whitehead’s God is “successful,” Lee believes, because his God “does not fail against the demands of the contemporary mind for a one-world reality; and at the same time God is essential for the real world as we know it.”<sup>202</sup> Why does Whitehead describe God as “essential”? Because without “God”—what Sarkar describes as “a process and a possibility”<sup>203</sup>—as the initiator of all occasions, there would be no way to understand the “incredible fact—that what cannot be, yet is.”<sup>204</sup> Whitehead’s “brilliantly novel” argument for God is based on these reasons:

- Because the “‘living’ subjective present” and dynamism for self-creation “cannot originate from the ‘dead’ objective past,”<sup>205</sup> God is the actual entity that provides the living immediacy needed by every forming entity to begin its concrescence. Whitehead’s God is the entity-in-process that exists as a *condition* upon which the dynamic process of becoming depends.<sup>206</sup>
- Forms that have been actualized in the past are available through those past entities, but if forming occasions were restricted only to what had already been achieved in the world, there would be no way for the truly novel to ever emerge and the world would only be capable of “mere repetition of the same forms.”<sup>207</sup> Identifying God as the entity that makes novel forms available is the only way to explain genuine novelty in the world.”<sup>208</sup>
- It would be “inconceivable” for every occasion to survey and evaluate the unlimited number of possibilities that the entire universe is capable of manifesting at any time;

---

<sup>201</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 15.

<sup>202</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 87.

<sup>203</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, v.

<sup>204</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 350.

<sup>205</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 159.

<sup>206</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 78.

<sup>207</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 157.

<sup>208</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 99.

moreover, “order and value both require some limitation or restriction within totally abstract possibility for their occurrence” and the lack of such limitation or restriction would result in a kind of chaos that we do not witness. God is the “ground of order and value” that “selectively limits” possibilities, grounds their relationships, allows the experience of value within possibilities by providing its standard.<sup>209</sup>

If there is a God, if there is truly a transpersonal reality that seeks our good and offers us novel possibilities, then how can we grasp the painful aspects of our reality—the ongoing flux and change—and the creative diversity that we witness? Is there a point to all of it? Is there value to this world? Must a painful past be a life sentence or are there really possibilities for transformation?

### **Multiplicity and Flux**

To be human—to be *embodied*—is to be part of a world of perpetual perishing and creation, of beauty and terror, of joy and sorrow. Though this is a painful reality, the multiplicity and flux that we see in the world is inevitable because of the *creativity*—what Bracken calls the “divine matrix”<sup>210</sup>—at the heart of reality. In Whitehead’s scheme, Creativity is both the “ground of events” and the “ultimate principle of cosmology” responsible for the fact that anything comes to be in existence at all. Faber describes it as a principle of both “*spontaneity* and *causality*.”<sup>211</sup> There are those process thinkers who describe *creativity* as being “ultimate,” but A.H. Johnson provides key insights into the relationships between God, creativity, the “many” and the “one.” He notes that creativity is ultimate not in the sense of having a “concrete character” or of being

---

<sup>209</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 159–60.

<sup>210</sup> Joseph A. Bracken, *The Divine Matrix: Creativity As Link Between East and West* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), *passim*.

<sup>211</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 76.

“an external agency with its own ulterior purposes,” but only in the sense that nothing can be actual without exemplifying it. In fact, “creativity,” “many,” and “one,” are all “ultimate” eternal objects because all are exemplified in every actuality. Creativity is a “characteristic of self-causation” and is only “saved from being a ‘nonentity’” because God’s primordial nature “envisages” it.<sup>212</sup>

In a sense, we can say that creativity is one reason for the flux and perpetual perishing we see in the world, yet creaturely freedom is also part of the story. We must remember that in Whitehead’s process of concrescence, it is the individual entity that finally decides what it will be, what value it will (or will not) actualize. As Lee writes, “It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the derivation of an initial aim from God does not remove the freedom of an actual entity. An actual entity is always free to decide finally what it will become.”<sup>213</sup> Individual entities have agency, and no outcomes are predetermined by God or coerced into being by God. Therefore, as Christ argues,

In a world where individuals other than Goddess/God really exist, the power of Goddess/God can never be ‘power over,’ but always and everywhere is ‘power with.’ Power over is domination. Power with is cooperation, partnership, and mutuality. Goddess/God is the eternal Thou, fully and appropriately related to every individual in the universe. Goddess/God is the one for whom no individual in the universe ever becomes merely an ‘it.’ The power of Goddess/God is to influence and be influenced by, to persuade and to be persuaded. The power of Goddess/God is to encourage all individuals to use their freedom and creativity to increase the beauty and harmony of the world. The power of Goddess/God is like that of a ‘mother, influencing, but sympathetic to and hence influenced by, her child and delighting in its growing creativity and freedom.’ Creation is always co-creation. What happens in the world is never the result of any single will, not even that of Goddess/God. A multiplicity of wills has combined with chance to create the world as we know it. Because the world is co-created, everything that

---

<sup>212</sup> Johnson, *Whitehead’s Theory of Reality*, 70.

<sup>213</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 95.

happens does not happen according to divine will. Because the world is co-created, everything that happens does not have a purpose in a divine plan.<sup>214</sup>

We live, love, feel, and strive within a dynamically undulating and dual *but not bifurcated* mystery that is “both physical and mental...transient and persistent; it is fact and value together, for, though value is timeless and immortal, it loses its meaning apart from its necessary reference to the world of passing fact.”<sup>215</sup> In other words, a world without fragmentary, multiplicitous, perpetually perishing aspects would be a world in which no value could be experienced as real because it would have no specificity.<sup>216</sup>

### Value

Although there is a unity experienced by every occasion in its forming—as it completes the concrescent integration of all its relationships and decides what it will be—that unity does not endure; it is “that of an experiencing subject in the immediacy of its becoming...momentary in its duration.”<sup>217</sup> As soon as occasions form, they perish, and so have no history and no future. Yet an *event* is comprised of an “historic route of successive occasions”<sup>218</sup> which enjoys a certain kind of unity. When we point to a thing or a person, we are actually identifying what Whitehead called a “society” or “nexus”—an “enduring group” that possesses “a shared manner of feeling and action, a common character or ethos.”<sup>219</sup> Such “social groupings of occasions” dominate our conscious experience. Even though they are not “the final facts of actuality” or completely “real”

---

<sup>214</sup> Christ, *She Who Changes*, 93–94.

<sup>215</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead's Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 15.

<sup>216</sup> It is not only worldviews that can be wounding or healing: reality itself may carry both properties. How can a reality that allows for differentiation avoid wounding? How can a reality that intimately receives and feels everything the world gives and offers novel possibilities for positive change avoid healing? In a cosmos where differentiation and unity dance in constantly fluid motion, we may conclude that wounding and healing are dipolar dance partners, inextricably bound.

<sup>217</sup> Loomer, “The Size of God,” 40.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid.

in the way that actual occasions are, societies of occasions are what endure while “actual occasions are continually ‘perishing’ into the past.” Yet they show us that “the actual world is through and through social in character.”<sup>220</sup>

Whitehead’s ontological theory—that every occasion of any type is formed in the same way—according to Hosinski, “enables us to take our poets and their intuitions seriously. It enables us to see and take into account in a systematic way the factors in reality to which their intuitions testify, without denying that scientific analysis also testifies to factors in reality...” This theory allows us to embrace the element of value as being at the basis of experience. “Whitehead’s ontological theory,” he continues, “connects value to actuality on the most fundamental level, in the self-constitution of every occasion in the universe. This enables us to see that science and poetry are not two opposed visions of the world, but rather are attending to different aspects of our world.”<sup>221</sup>

There are no inert substances at the base of our world that endure unchanged through time. We recognize this empirical truth immediately when we think about the way in which an oak tree is no longer the acorn from which it began, and an adult human is no longer the infant. We are people-in-process, gaining and losing cells, growing and changing, living out the dance between order and chaos in every moment. For Whitehead, an actual entity “never really is”—rather, it is

[A] drop of process, a pulse, a throb of existence, an event, a happening of value which sacrifices its immediacy in the instant it is gained, in the same manner as any ‘now’ loses its nowness to a subsequent ‘now’...What is permanent in the Whiteheadian scheme is not, therefore, some underlying stage upon which accidental change is played, but rather the value achieved, the world-unification effected by and in an entity whose self-creative process is the growing together of

---

<sup>220</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 138–39.

<sup>221</sup> *Ibid.*, 94–95.

the public world in the privacy of a perspective...To exist in the Whiteheadian sense is to self-actuate, to create a moment of 'for-one's-self-ness,' to be now.<sup>222</sup>

According to Kraus, the “foundational insight” of Whitehead’s philosophy is expressed in two “inseparable notions”: “the permanence of value achieved” and “the ongoingness of value achievement.”<sup>223</sup> Neither *being* nor *becoming* can therefore be preferenced; what is most real is the *value attained* in their dynamic dance.

### Transformation

The creative dance of becoming inherently entails flux, perishing, and loss. This is the wounding reality of embodied experience. Therefore, all of us have things in our past that are painful. Yet many of us find ourselves thinking or behaving in ways that prevent our own flourishing because “old habits” or old patterns of thinking “die hard.” For those of us who fight those battles, process thought provides a hopeful vision of reality because it promises that novelty or positive change—aligned with God’s aims—is possible in every moment. “Every living individual,” Christ reminds us, “is born, grows, and then dies. The world is a web of changing individuals interacting with, affecting, and changing each other. The body is the locus of changing life. Not to be embodied, not to change, is not to be alive.”<sup>224</sup> In process theology, God is the “goad toward novelty” and the “basic source of unrest in the universe”; as Whitehead notes, “The pure conservative is fighting against the essence of the universe.”<sup>225</sup>

In process thought, God is no “Sanctioner of the Status Quo” but stimulates us “to realize new possibilities after the old ones no longer are sufficient to give zest to our enjoyment of being

---

<sup>222</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 2.

<sup>223</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>224</sup> Christ, *She Who Changes*, 45.

<sup>225</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 59.

actual.”<sup>226</sup> The reason for being is enjoyment of experience, intensity, adventure, and therefore, God seeks novelty as much as order. In describing why God seeks intensity through novelty, Whitehead writes that “the origination of conceptual novelty” is “the primary meaning of life,”<sup>227</sup> and that “the ‘aim at contrast’ is the expression of the ultimate creative purpose that each unification shall achieve some maximum depth of intensity of feeling, subject to the conditions of its concrescence.”<sup>228</sup> Living occasions are distinguished by their capacity for realizing this “flash of novelty among [their] appetitions.”<sup>229</sup> At the same time, we must understand that neither order nor novelty are “intrinsically good” but are only “instrumental to the one intrinsic good” or “absolute end” which is “the enjoyment of intense experience... both order and novelty are good only insofar as they contribute to the enjoyment of experience.”<sup>230</sup>

## SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have shown that Whitehead’s system: (1) describes the depths of unconscious experience as the source of dynamism, value, and creative advance; (2) describes an integrated and relational reality that grounds both the world and the individual; and, (3) respects and fosters multiplicity, diversity, and individual contributions of value. We can recognize now that process thought describes a world where everyone matters, everyone belongs, and everyone can experience positive change. We can recognize that we are part of a cosmos where we can encounter God as a transpersonal reality to whom we are internally related, who feels everything the world is and does, and who offers us possibilities for realization that are novel and will increase our enjoyment and zest for life. If this is all true of our outer world, what of our inner

---

<sup>226</sup> Ibid., 59, 60.

<sup>227</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 102.

<sup>228</sup> Ibid., 249.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid., 184.

<sup>230</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 59.



psyche? Is there a system of thought that shows our psychological selves as integrated and relational as well? This is our destination in the next chapter on Carl Gustav Jung and his analytical psychology.

## CHAPTER 4:

### EMPIRICAL: AN INTEGRATED, RELATIONAL PSYCHE

The classic symbol for alienation is the image of the wilderness. And it is here, characteristically, that some manifestation of God is encountered.

—Edward Edinger, *Ego and Archetype*

### INTRODUCTION

We begin this chapter on C. G. Jung's analytical psychology with goals similar to those in the previous chapter: in order for this system of thought to counter the fragmenting effects of the dominant worldview in American culture it, too, must show 1) that we have value, that we *matter*; 2) that we *belong*; and 3) that we can experience *positive change*. In addition, if it is our goal to synthesize Whitehead's theoretical and Jung's empirical resources, we must also show that Jung's psychology is to the human psyche as Whitehead's metaphysics is to the cosmos. In the following pages, I will demonstrate that Jungian thought (1) describes the depths of unconscious experience as the source of vitality, dynamism, and creativity; (2) describes an integrated and relational psyche; and, (3) respects and fosters individual contributions of value.

### PSYCHOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS

We will begin by examining the foundations of Jung's psychology, focusing on the conscious and unconscious psyche, ego and Self, the relationship between mind, body, and world, how human experience includes persona, neurosis, and trauma, and the process of individuation. Whereas in the last chapter we discussed the *beginnings* of experience, here we will explore the primordial life and objective psyche at the *depths* of experience followed by an analysis of Jung's ideas regarding transpersonal reality, including the collective unconscious,

archetypes and archetypal images, archetypal value and synchronicity, and finally Jung's understanding of God and the healing power of the unconscious.

### **Conscious and Unconscious**

The foundations of Jung's analytical psychology must, of course, begin with the human psyche, something that, in many respects, is impossible to define. The psyche "mediates all experience" and, as Shelburne notes, for that reason, "there is no standpoint above or outside psychology that would enable us to form an ultimate judgment of what the psyche is."<sup>1</sup> Though we may never be able to definitively judge the nature of the human psyche, we can begin to explore the ways in which it seems to function. Sigmund Freud viewed the human mind as a system constantly attempting to maintain a dynamic equilibrium between opposing forces. His "structural hypothesis" described it as tripartite and made up of ego, id, and superego. Those three "are not immutably demarcated compartments," writes Jacob Arlow, "but operational concepts. Intrapsychic conflict is the situation par excellence which lays bare the differentiation of these functional centers in the mind."<sup>2</sup> For Freud, the mind's equilibrium "was constantly being disturbed and re-established."<sup>3</sup> Following his mentor's lead in this area, Jung also describes the human psyche as a "self-regulating system that maintains itself in equilibrium as the body does."<sup>4</sup> For both Freud and Jung, the human psyche is both conscious and unconscious.

Jung described consciousness as "intensive and concentrated," "transient" and "directed upon the immediate present and the immediate field of attention...it has access only to material that represents one individual's experience stretching over a few decades." He considered

---

<sup>1</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 15–16.

<sup>2</sup> Jacob A. Arlow, *Legacy of Sigmund Freud* (New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1956), 45.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>4</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 17.

anything that came into awareness as taking on the quality of consciousness and what did not rise to consciousness, remained unconscious. In Jung's system, as in Freud's, the "organ of awareness" is referred to as the "ego," yet for Jung, "a whole other sphere lies outside the ego. This is characterized as the non-ego field, the unconscious." The unconscious is not concentrated, but "shades off into obscurity," is "highly extensive" and "can juxtapose the most heterogeneous elements in the most paradoxical way."<sup>5</sup> The ego is a "changeable" *complex* with a "fluctuating composition"; it is the "image or reflection of all the activities comprehended by it"<sup>6</sup> and so is not a substantialist entity. Consciousness and unconsciousness are constantly in a state of dynamic interplay and so they are understood as being part of the same system, though not alike.<sup>7</sup> In the same way that particle physicists can only view subatomic particles "through their by-products," Robertson notes that the unconscious can only be seen through its by-products as well.<sup>8</sup> "Since we perceive effects whose origin cannot be found in consciousness," Jung writes, "we are compelled to allow hypothetical contents to the sphere of the non-conscious..."<sup>9</sup> Singer notes that Jung differentiated even further between two layers of the unconscious.

These are, in Jungian terms, the *personal unconscious* and the *collective unconscious*...The collective unconscious may be thought of as an impersonal or transpersonal unconscious because, as Jung says, 'It is detached from anything personal and is entirely universal, and because its contents can be found everywhere, which is naturally not the case with personal contents.'...in the psychological material brought up by individuals, the personal material shows the effects of its collective background and often is as a personal voice giving expression to an age-old liturgy.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 186.

<sup>6</sup> C. G. Jung, *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Corrected, vol. 8, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), 324–25.

<sup>7</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 15.

<sup>8</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 143.

<sup>9</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 27.

<sup>10</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 103.

A favorite metaphor of Jung's was that "individual consciousness is only the flower and the fruit of a season, sprung from the perennial rhizome beneath the earth..."<sup>11</sup> He waxes poetic in his description of the unconscious when he writes,

More than this, it contains, besides an interminable number of subliminal perceptions, an immense fund of accumulated inheritance-factors left by one generation of [people] after another, whose mere existence marks a step in the differentiation of the species. If it were permissible to personify the unconscious, we might call it a collective human being combining the characteristics of both sexes, transcending youth and age, birth and death, and, from having at [its] command a human experience of one or two million years, almost immortal. If such a being existed, [it] would be exalted above all temporal change, the present would mean neither more nor less to [it] than any year in the one hundredth century before Christ; [it] would be a dreamer of age-old dreams and, owing to [its] immeasurable experience, [it] would be an incomparable prognosticator. [It] would have lived countless times over the life of the individual, of the family, tribe and people, and [it] would possess the living sense of the rhythm of growth, flowering and decay.<sup>12</sup>

The interplay between consciousness and unconsciousness is compensatory in nature, meaning that whenever the attitude of the conscious ego goes too far in one direction (preferencing any one of the inherently opposing energies in the psyche over its counterpart), there is an "immediate" and "inevitable" opposite movement "called forth" from the unconscious to bring the system back into balance.<sup>13</sup> Robertson compares its functioning to that of a "complex version of a thermostat...cooling things down when they get too hot, heating them up when too cold."<sup>14</sup> The result is a flow of symbolic imagery that can appear in dreams and in other nondirected, or nonconscious, thinking. When unconscious elements "become charged with energy" due to the psyche's unbalanced state, those contents "intrude themselves into conscious

---

<sup>11</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 29.

<sup>12</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 186.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>14</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 211.

awareness and produce a so-called lowering of consciousness with a consequent disruption of conscious intentionalities.”<sup>15</sup> Jung writes,

Without such adjustments a normal metabolism would not exist, nor would the normal psyche...The relation between conscious and unconscious is compensatory. This fact, which is easily verifiable, affords a rule for dream interpretation. It is always helpful, when we set out to interpret a dream, to ask: What conscious attitude does it compensate?<sup>16</sup>

The problem in modern times, Jung felt, was that the overemphasis on the directedness of consciousness and dismissal of the unconscious material as “incompatible” had created such an inhibition of unconscious material that the compensatory function was no longer effective. “To this extent,” he wrote, “the psyche of civilized [people] is no longer a self-regulating system but could rather be compared to a machine whose speed-regulation is so insensitive that it can continue to function to the point of self-injury, while on the other hand it is subject to the arbitrary manipulations of a one-sided will.”<sup>17</sup>

The key elements of this section reveal that Jung saw the human psyche as made up of a conscious ego and an unconscious non-ego field, with these two aspects in a constant dialectical relationship. Due to the compensatory nature of the relationship between conscious and unconscious, we can understand the unconscious as providing whatever the conscious ego needs to regain its balance. In other words, it provides whatever the individual needs to flourish. It is important to note that as with Whitehead, the most basic elements of Jung’s system are in no way static entities; rather, they are fluid elements that are in dynamic interplay. In Jung’s description of the individual consciousness as arising from the perennial rhizome of the unconscious, we are

---

<sup>15</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 27.

<sup>16</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 17.

<sup>17</sup> C. G. Jung, *The Portable Jung*, ed. Joseph Campbell (New York: Viking Press, 1971), 285–86.

reminded of Whitehead's view that individual entities particularize the extensive continuum. Each is a rupturing, a breaking through of individuality and of uniquely expressed value.

### **Ego and Self**

Whereas in Whitehead's thought the individual person we know ourselves to be—what we typically refer to as the *self*—is viewed as a *historic route of occasions*, we might refer to Jung's *ego* as a *historic route of images*. Jung describes the *ego* or *ego complex* as a “highly composite factor” that is “made up of images recorded from the sense-functions that transmit stimuli both from within and from without, and furthermore of an immense accumulation of images of past processes.” It is only consciousness or directed thinking that provides the “powerful cohesive force” to hold the accumulation of images together.<sup>18</sup> In addition to the compensatory role of the psyche, there is an element in the unconscious that plays an organizing or ordering role, and it is from these unconscious depths of human life that the more-fleeting consciousness emerges. Robertson uses the example of driving a car to note how the unconscious apparently organizes and makes available to consciousness the memories of previous driving experience. He writes,

...the part of our psyche that organizes and presents us with all the memories, psychic and muscular, needed to drive an auto, has to be on a higher level than the memories themselves. That is, there has to be something that organizes those memories; such an organizer is inherently at a different level of psychic organization than the memories it organizes. The unconscious is thus less a static repository of personal and collective material than an active organizational entity which serves and even anticipates the needs of consciousness.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1969, 8:323.

<sup>19</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 160.

Edinger notes that Jung saw the psyche as “archetypal,” and its “structuring or ordering principle” he called the archetypal *Self*.<sup>20</sup> McGehee describes this Self as a “force” that holds all the “disparate, paradoxical, and often conflictual elements” of the psyche together.

The Self integrates rather than disintegrates; it creates rather than destroys. It is the part of the psyche that generates and transforms life. It is that aspect of ourselves that urges—even requires—us to continue to evolve as we muddle along in our journey to wholeness...To be human is to have a Self, but to be estranged, alienated, or disconnected from this Self is to suffer tremendously.<sup>21</sup>

The Self is “that factor in the psychic economy which establishes wholeness” and the “unifying center” of the person and, therefore, is “indistinguishable from the God-image, which represents the highest unifying factor.”<sup>22</sup> It is experienced by the ego as a “spiritual event” and has been referred to by mystics historically as the “ground of the soul” or “the little castle”; Louis Dupré refers to it as the “secret dwelling where God resides” and “the center of my created being which remains permanently united with God’s creative act...the sanctuary without images, as Plotinus called it.”<sup>23</sup> Jung borrowed the term Self from the Hindu notion of *Atman*, and Kalsched notes that it represents the “personality’s potential wholeness”: It “constitutes an ‘ineffable subject of the unconscious’ and its dialectic with the ego—or ‘phenomenal subject of consciousness’ (Grotstein) —establishes an ego-Self axis that guides the individuation process.”<sup>24</sup> Tacey goes so far as to summarize Jung’s entire psychology as a “science of the relations between the human person (ego) and the God Within (the Self).”<sup>25</sup> Jung first encountered this “not-I”<sup>26</sup> or “objective ‘knower’” in the psyche in a dream of his own wherein a “super-ordinate wisdom from the deep unconscious” had this to say:

---

<sup>20</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 3.

<sup>21</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 78.

<sup>22</sup> Nicolaus, *C.G. Jung and Nikolai Berdyaev*, 127.

<sup>23</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 7.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 128.

<sup>25</sup> Tacey, “The Challenge of Teaching Jung in the University,” 18.

<sup>26</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 210.



I can see your wholeness...and in order to convince you of this, I'm going to present my image of your wholeness in universal imagery of aliveness, beauty, color, and light, all around a radiant center which has everything to do with you, and only with you. And the closer you get to this center of your own particular, individual, irreplaceable life—including your own abysmal sadness—the closer you get to me.<sup>27</sup>

Though the common understanding of the term “self” typically equates it with the conscious ego, Jung saw the archetypal Self as both personal or immanent *and* transcendent. It is the “paradox from which all paradox originated” and “cannot be limited by human expectations.”<sup>28</sup> The Self is “the inner wisdom that produces dreams,” and so working with dreams, then, is the “paramount method in Jungian analysis.”<sup>29</sup> In fact, it is because of the images in dreams that Jung determined the Self to stand outside of space and time.

Jung found that at the deepest levels of the unconscious, there are seemingly no longer any such limits: dreams can roam over times hundreds or even thousands of years in the past; dreams can show events years in the future. The Self transcends all limits of personal morality, yet its values are beyond denial. The Self can be the dreamer's deepest personality, the process of development, and the goal of the process, all wrapped up in one entity.<sup>30</sup>

The Self is “that center of being which the ego circumambulates; at the same time, it is the superordinate factor in a system in which the ego is subordinate.”<sup>31</sup> It represents both the “centering tendency” of the psyche as well as its “final conscious unity”; it is “the teleological aim of individuation,” and the “union of opposites.”<sup>32</sup> Haule likens it to the life of an amoeba, a being which has no ego or “organ of command...Nevertheless,

it ceaselessly marshals all its forces, all the molecules that comprise it, for the optimal enhancement of its life in the present moment. Our personal, human

---

<sup>27</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 168.

<sup>28</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 205–6.

<sup>29</sup> Fredrica R. Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” in *Handbook of Religious Experience*, ed. Ralph W. Hood (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1995), 246.

<sup>30</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 206.

<sup>31</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 210.

<sup>32</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 241.

wholeness is much the same, a ceaseless homeodynamic system operating mostly out of our awareness.<sup>33</sup>

Various themes and typical images are associated with the Self including the “mandalas based on circles or squares” or “quadrated figures,”<sup>34</sup> totality, the union of opposites, “the central generative point, the world navel, the axis of the universe,” the “elixir of life,”<sup>35</sup> a great tree or mountain, or even “the Wise Old One” or “the Queen” (or King).<sup>36</sup> But the Self is not a static, once-for-all-time image. It is a God-image that “changes and transforms” both individually and collectively, particularly during “crisis points” when it “has lost its unifying, balancing capacity” and no longer serves to unify the opposites.

Now we can see that the human psyche, as Jung understood it, is highly relational in its constant dialogue between conscious and unconscious, and between ego and Self. The Self, moreover, integrates and orders the psyche’s experience, holding it all together, and is both immanent God-image within, and transcendent because it is outside of space and time. Yet, as we will see next, transcendent, for Jung, never means disembodied or supernatural and it is, in fact, the Self that unifies mind and body.

### **Mind, Body, World**

Jung was no dualist. In *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, he wrote that he “could not guess” what “life” might be “in and for itself, in an abstract state” and claimed that he knows “‘life’ only in the form of a living body.”<sup>37</sup> The body is not a “mere heaping together of inert matter” but is a “material system ready for life” that yet cannot live without the “living

---

<sup>33</sup> John Haule, “Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions,” in *Teaching Jung*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, AAR Teaching Religious Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 152.

<sup>34</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 243.

<sup>35</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 4.

<sup>36</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 243.

<sup>37</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1969, 8:320.

being” or “psychic factor” made up of “living processes.”<sup>38</sup> What he called “the psyche” is made up of an “almost infinite series” of images reproduced by the brain to represent unconscious bodily states and impressions and the conscious ego is the “powerful cohesive force” that holds them together.<sup>39</sup>

When Jung asserts that what is real to us is psychic, some have interpreted his stance in a Kantian sense. Yet this is unwarranted because Jung was trying to counter the materialist and mechanistic views that were in vogue at the height of modernism. As a counterpoint to physicalist positions of behaviorism and the hard sciences, he insisted that “it is an almost absurd prejudice to suppose that existence can only be physical.” He concluded that “the only form of existence of which we have immediate knowledge is psychic.”<sup>40</sup> Moreover, his use of the term “immediate knowledge” was most likely used to indicate “conscious awareness” or “understanding.”<sup>41</sup> which, of course, is entirely psychic. Jung in no way believed that the mind created the objective world. He had no doubt of an objective world that was “encountered outwardly”; yet he also gave the same credence to an objective world that was “experienced inwardly”: both inner and outer worlds are “nature,”<sup>42</sup> and, he speculated, both could be known only “as phenomena and never as the ‘thing-in-itself’” because humans could not yet understand either the true nature of matter or of God.<sup>43</sup> Jung, in fact, speculated about the “ultimate identity of psyche and matter”<sup>44</sup> because he saw archetypes as participating in both. They are *material*, in that they “exist in the body at the level of instincts” *and* they are *immaterial*, in that they exist

---

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 8:321.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 8:323.

<sup>40</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 591.

<sup>41</sup> Coward, “Taoism and Jung,” 488. Coward quotes Jung as saying that “to understand metaphysically is impossible; it can only be done psychologically.”

<sup>42</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 139.

<sup>43</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 98, 105.

<sup>44</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 133.

transpersonally as form. They have a “bodily, instinctual” pole and a spiritual pole, and both are “vitally interrelated.”<sup>45</sup> In fact, Rowland compares Jung’s “subtle body” to Judith Butler’s “discursive body” when she writes that

What is especially fascinating about the Jungian subtle body is that it is not a creature of the body, nor of the mind; it represents the union of both. Therefore the subtle body transcends that characteristic Enlightenment binary splitting of body away from mind. The subtle body is that point where mind and body meet, and one cannot be given priority over the other. Neither mind nor body can be ‘translated’ into the other. Therefore ‘words’ cannot ever completely describe nor evoke the subtle body, for they are the creatures of the conscious ego. Only symbols will do, for: ‘The symbol is neither abstract nor concrete, neither rational nor irrational, neither real nor unreal. It is always both...’<sup>46</sup>

In fact, it is the archetype of the Self that serves as the unifying point for body, soul, mind, and spirit, forming an “integrated whole” especially in the process of individuation, when unconscious contents are assimilated to the ego.<sup>47</sup>

In her critique on Jung’s archetypal theory, Goldenberg asserts that “feminine theory [should] radically depart from the Jungian archetype, from the Platonic form, from all systems of thought which posit transcendent, superhuman deities...I suggest that we seek our inspiration from theories and disciplines which see the body as the nexus of all human experience...”<sup>48</sup> Yet basing all our inspiration in the solitary human seems antithetical to the principle of interrelatedness and interconnectedness so crucial to feminist theology. Even contemporary Jungians question this stance, as does James Hillman in his forward to Theodore Roszak’s text *EcoPsychology*.

There is only one core issue for all psychology. Where is the ‘me’? Where does the ‘me’ begin? Where does the ‘me’ stop? Where does the ‘other’ begin? For most of its history, psychology took for granted an intentional subject: the biographical ‘me’ that was the agent and sufferer of all ‘doings.’ For most of its

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., 134.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>47</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 209.

<sup>48</sup> Goldenberg, “Archetypal Theory and the Separation of Mind and Body,” 64.

history, psychology located this ‘me’ within human persons defined by their physical skin and their immediate behavior. The subject was simply ‘me in my body and in my relations with other subjects’...Over the past twenty years all this has been scrutinized, dismantled, and even junked. Postmodernism has deconstructed continuity, self, intention, identity, centrality, gender, individuality...How far away is the ‘other’? Is it Wholly Other and therefore like a ‘God,’ as Rudolf Otto believed? Or, is the ‘not-me’ an inherently related other, a ‘Thou’ in Martin Buber’s sense? If we can no longer be sure that we are who we remember we are, where then do we make the cut between ‘me’ and ‘not-me’?<sup>49</sup>

Stephen Aizenstat of Pacifica Graduate Institute, too, sees our “psychic inheritance” as “an endowment rooted most essentially in the rhythms of nature.”<sup>50</sup> In encountering one’s “deep self,” Hillman argues that one must not only journey to her or his “interior” but must also “harmonize” with the outer world. “The deepest self,” he writes,

cannot be confined to ‘in here’ because we can’t be sure it is not also or even entirely ‘out there’! If we listen to Roszak, and to Freud and Jung, the most profoundly collective and unconscious self is the natural material world. Since the cut between the self and natural world is arbitrary, we can make it the skin or we can take it as far out as you like—to the deep oceans and distant stars. But the cut is far less important than the recognition of uncertainty about making the cut at all.<sup>51</sup>

Goldenberg’s charges of dualism aimed at Jung are clearly misplaced. Moreover, there are still valid and valuable resources within the Jungian frame to counter the dualistic, mechanistic thinking that contributes to our fragmentation. We turn now to Jung’s views of the psyche’s response to the slings and arrows we inevitably encounter as we move through life.

---

<sup>49</sup> Stephen Aizenstat, “Jungian Psychology and the World Unconscious,” in *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind*, ed. Theodore Roszak, Mary E. Gomes, and Allen D. Kanner (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1995), xvii–xviii.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, xviii.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, xix.

## Persona, Neurosis, and Trauma

The First Noble Truth of Buddhism is typically translated as “Life is suffering.” To be human, it seems, is to have problems.<sup>52</sup> When the inevitable problems arise, resourceful and creative humans can often find a myriad of ways to resolve them—both individually and collectively. On the other hand, mental health providers’ offices are full of people with seemingly unsolvable problems while many more such people never even grace the thresholds of those that stand ready to help. For many, self-sabotaging behavior and difficult interpersonal relations seem to return with revolving-door regularity, leading such individuals to substance abuse and despair. Such distress may often fall into the clinical category of neurosis.

For Jung, personality only develops at all because of the tensions between opposing forces that “underpin” the psyche.<sup>53</sup> Such conflicts include those between the instinctual and the spiritual and those between our personal desires and collective expectations. For Halligan, managing those conflicts “requires certain compromises,” especially during the first half of life when one’s gender identity and ego-strengths are developing. The compromises we make require “role-playing and a certain degree of falsification” and so the resulting way we move through the world is called our *persona*.<sup>54</sup>

While our persona is held in consciousness, any elements of our personality that we do not accept—whether the “dark and foreboding” qualities we find unappealing or the positive aspects we are not yet willing to claim—are held in the unconscious and make up what Jung called the *shadow*. In dream images, the shadow is typically personified as an “unappealing

---

<sup>52</sup> Here again we encounter the inevitable wounding of life experience.

<sup>53</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 30.

<sup>54</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 239. The word “persona” is taken from the word for the stage masks used in ancient Greek theater.

figure who is the same sex as the dreamer,” and is “everything we don’t want to be. Or rather it is perhaps everything we would like to be but don’t dare. The shadow is everything we don’t want others to know about us. It is everything we don’t even want to know about ourselves and have thus conveniently ‘forgotten’ through denial and repression.”<sup>55</sup> As Robertson notes, it is in a compensatory response that the shadow is activated when one’s ego consciousness has become unbalanced and is no longer manifesting the natural wholeness of the organizing Self. The shadow develops whenever the “ego has accepted a limited definition of itself, at the expense of undeveloped possibilities or denied desires, frequently those of the body.”<sup>56</sup>

In his clinical experiences with patients, Jung observed that their dreams included images of both masculine and feminine characters, and so he concluded that the psyches of men and women contain both masculine and feminine aspects. Every culture, society, or era typically considers some behaviors more acceptable than others for each gender, and so behaviors typically associated with one’s opposite sex are often relegated to the unconscious where they are “[personified] into contra-sexual figures, just as the unacknowledged same-sex side of our personality forms into the shadow. This female within the male Jung called the anima; the male within the female he termed the animus.”<sup>57</sup> As noted in Chapter 2, it is this area of Jungian psychology that has drawn the most serious criticism from feminist scholars. Yet it is important to note that at their most basic levels, Jung believed that the archetypes of anima and animus are merely predispositions to form personified images that represent the relationship between the ego and the unconscious, and are therefore empty of specific content.<sup>58</sup> Specific images or symbols formed are the result of personal experience and cultural conditioning. Therefore, the function

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid.

<sup>56</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 209.

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., 193.

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 194.

precedes the personification. As the personality develops beyond gender identity and a functioning ego, the process that Jung called individuation becomes more focused on “personality unification and wholeness. This requires that “the contrasexual elements of personality that were previously held in the unconscious must be brought to consciousness and integrated into one’s sense of identity. It is time for the ‘inner marriage’ to begin.”<sup>59</sup>

Also within the unconscious human psyche are the “complexes that are responsible for so much of our self-limiting and self-punishing behavior.” Even if we experienced healthy childhoods and loving parents, McGehee reminds us that “to be human is to have complexes.”<sup>60</sup> Complexes emerge due to the “dissociability of the psyche” whose nature it is to “divide itself up into parts” whenever it is “faced with anxiety.”<sup>61</sup> Jung first posited the existence of psychological complexes because some of his patients exhibited slower responses to certain words during word association exercises. For example, he might have noticed that a patient responded more slowly to any words having to do with the idea of “mother,” and so “Jung guessed that the patient had some emotional blockage concerning mother. That is, there was energy trapped in the unconscious around the concept of mother,”<sup>62</sup> writes Robertson.

Much of the analytic task became a process of stripping away the personal memories in order to find out what lay at the core of this complex...At the core of the mother complex, Jung found not a personal memory of mother but a collective, archetypal memory of the complex relationship between child and mother. Thus archetypes are activated when necessary, and accumulate personal memories around themselves to form complexes.<sup>63</sup>

In other words, there is a basic idea of what *mother* is and does that then acts as the lattice “structure” upon which each era or culture’s specific expectations of how mothers behave is

---

<sup>59</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 240.

<sup>60</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 50.

<sup>61</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 165.

<sup>62</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 169.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid.



“hung.” When our personal experience collides with those expectations, Young-Eisendrath and Hall note that we can tend to “collect” our own experiences around a “compelling affective-imaginal core” in a “loosely coherent” way that then becomes a “motivational system of emotion and image-formation that is associated with habitual thoughts, actions, feelings, and other images.”<sup>64</sup> Our unconscious complexes can wreak havoc in our personal lives, as they are most often triggered in our significant relationships, causing something akin to a “trance state” when we are “beside ourselves” and automatically “reexperience” emotions and images that arise simply because another person’s mannerisms or appearance evoke that unconscious complex.<sup>65</sup> At such times, we can appear to be incapable of acting consciously. McGehee describes complexes as “chronic, low-grade, and often lifelong viewpoints we have about ourselves” that “constrict” and “limit” human wholeness and wellbeing.<sup>66</sup> Yet—and this is good news for anyone with adverse childhood experiences that have become entrenched as limiting beliefs—such complexes will “fall apart” when brought to consciousness and integrated into the personality.<sup>67</sup>

Jung viewed neurosis as the result of a “self-division”<sup>68</sup> or “inner cleavage—the state of being at war with oneself” wherein one’s conscious mind and unconscious mind are in opposition.<sup>69</sup> Polarized factions could be one’s spiritual self against one’s sensual self—one’s “better angels” against one’s “lesser angels”—or even just what is consciously known and accepted versus what is unconscious and denied. According to Jung, “What drives people to war with themselves is the intuition or the knowledge that they consist of two persons in opposition

---

<sup>64</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, 3.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 50.

<sup>67</sup> Ibid.

<sup>68</sup> C. G. Jung, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, trans. R. F. C. Hull, vol. 7, *The Collected Works of C.G. Jung*, Bollingen Series (New York: Pantheon Books, 1953), 20.

<sup>69</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 236.

to one another...It is what Faust meant when he says: ‘Two souls, alas, dwell in my breast apart.’”<sup>70</sup> Regardless of the cause, what differentiates mere problems from neuroses is that a neurosis is the result of an inability of the individual to “solve the general problem [of intrapersonal division or conflict] in his [or her] own person.”<sup>71</sup> But it may be even broader than that. Within his own practice, Heisig finds that

patients are more sensitive than the worlds they live in...I mean that the distortions of communication, the sense of harassment and alienation, the deprivation of intimacy with the immediate environment, the feelings of false values and inner worthlessness experienced relentlessly in the world of our common habitation are genuine realistic appraisals and not merely apperceptions of our intra-subjective selves. My practice tells me I can no longer distinguish clearly between neurosis of self and neurosis of world...This further implies that my theories of neurosis and categories of psychopathology must be radically extended if they are not to foster the very pathologies which my job is to ameliorate.<sup>72</sup>

Seems we may be justified, then, in calling into question the presumed originating causes of modern neuroses and again draw the lens back to see the effects of our culture and worldview upon our personal psyches. Persona, shadow, and complexes are all interwoven parts of the human psyche; and—as in Whitehead’s metaphysics—so is the basic drive to bring something of value individually and creatively to the communal web of life.

### **Individuation and Value: One’s Own Being**

As we saw in our earlier discussion of the structure of the psyche, Jung considered the ego to be the center of consciousness and the Self to be the center of the complete person “that we have the potential to become when the unconscious is integrated with the conscious.” One might be forgiven for describing the Self as an “enigma wrapped in a paradox,” for it is

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 236–37.

<sup>71</sup> Jung, *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*, 7:20.

<sup>72</sup> Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” 211.

maddeningly both the “state of wholeness that is the goal of individuation” while also being “the state of undifferentiated wholeness from which we come.”<sup>73</sup> Most importantly, the Self is the “not known”, the “numinous, potential, unconscious nature of every person” and knowledge of one’s Self is the purpose of *individuation*.<sup>74</sup> According to Singer, the energy that “provides the thrust” for the process of individuation is “goal-directed” and “purposive.” Being in the pull of such energy

feels as if one were being drawn toward a center of great luminosity, yet to fly straight into it would be like a moth darting into a flame or the earth hurtling itself into the center of the sun. So one moves around the center instead, close enough to see the brightness, to feel the warmth, but maintaining the orbital tension, a dynamic relationship of a small finite being to a source of light and energy that has no limits.”<sup>75</sup>

Individuation is the journey and the process of developing an ongoing dialogue between one’s conscious and unconscious, persona and shadow, conscious gender and unconscious contra-sexual elements,<sup>76</sup> so as to consciously realize and integrate “all of the possibilities contained within the individual.”<sup>77</sup> Robertson discusses the “four divisions” within human experience—physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual—and identifies “humanity’s unique task” as finding a “harmonious balance” between them. It is both modern society’s drive for humans to use their minds to keep instincts and spiritual needs in check, and the Church’s drive for “perfection” that have led to the subjection of the whole human to one of its parts, repressing all that is not valued into the unconscious shadow. Jung alternatively realized that wholeness—personal unity—should be our “proper goal.”<sup>78</sup>

Wholeness can only be achieved if each of the four parts can harmoniously contain and honor the other three...The integration of the contents of the shadow

---

<sup>73</sup> Fraser N. Watts, *Theology and Psychology* (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2002), 120.

<sup>74</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 33.

<sup>75</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 134.

<sup>76</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 240.

<sup>77</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 134.

<sup>78</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 207–9.

into the conscious personality can be seen as the final step in the integration of body, soul, and spirit within the mind. An integrated whole demands both control and harmony.<sup>79</sup>

Though Kalsched acknowledges that “Wholeness can be an abstract idea—all-inclusive and somewhat vague—in Jung, it means something unique, something related to psycho-spiritual integration.”<sup>80</sup> The journey to such wholeness is “a lifelong task” and an “elaborate and subtle process” in which one develops one’s “recessive potentials”<sup>81</sup> and develops a “healthy recognition and acceptance of who one truly is, in one’s essence and totality.”<sup>82</sup> For Kalsched,

Perhaps no other single notion is more central to Jung’s understanding of the human struggle than the idea of wholeness—our lifelong pursuit of it, and possibly *its lifelong pursuit of us*. For Jung, as we know, wholeness is a universal human urge or desire to fulfill all of oneself—all of one’s potentials, all the aspects of ourselves as they have come into being or failed to come into being in our particular environmental circumstances. The unfolding of this potential wholeness *from within* is what Jung meant by individuation—‘the strongest, the most ineluctable urge in every being, namely the urge to realize itself.’<sup>83</sup>

To realize oneself; as Jung wrote in his *Seven Sermons to the Dead*, “Not your thinking, but your being, is distinctiveness. Therefore not after difference, as ye think it, must ye strive; but after your own being.”<sup>84</sup> Though teleological, the Self is not so much a goal but the image that “governs” the process of individuation; “one does not so much ‘become’ [the Self] as one allows it to manifest itself.”<sup>85</sup>

What is the value of manifesting “one’s own being” in the world? For Jung—who witnessed the devastation of two World Wars—conforming to “collective consciousness” and becoming what he called a “mass man” was to be the subject of “stifling” collective attitudes.

---

<sup>79</sup> Ibid., 209.

<sup>80</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 165.

<sup>81</sup> Lauter and Rupprecht, “Feminist Archetypal Theory: A Proposal,” 224.

<sup>82</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 239.

<sup>83</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 165.

<sup>84</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 385.

<sup>85</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 68.

Far from aligning with the “status quo,” Jung saw the individuation process as one “whereby people could find their own direction and live according to their own sense of purpose”<sup>86</sup> rather than being seduced by various negative but powerful ideologies. “This magic word, which always ends in ‘ism,’” wrote Jung, “works most successfully with those who have the least access to their interior selves and have strayed the furthest from their instinctual roots into the truly chaotic world of *collective* consciousness.”<sup>87</sup> He argued that true morality rested on the *individual’s* moral sense and freedom whereas “the morality of a society as a whole is in inverse ratio to its size; for the greater the aggregation of individuals, the more the individual factors are blotted out, and with them morality...” For the “mass man,” mediocrity rules.<sup>88</sup> Jung’s student, Erich Neumann developed this idea even further, noting that morality comes from the “Voice of the Self” and through acceptance of one’s shadow which “involves a growth in depth into the ground of one’s own being, and with the loss of the airy illusion of an ego-ideal, a new depth and rootedness and stability is born.” Such a stance initiates a perspective wherein “continuous self-questioning and self-control is now required.”<sup>89</sup> In order to be self-reflective, argue Young-Eisendrath and Hall, one must be able to “differentiate from parental complexes that are the shapers and movers of one’s original sense of identity” and that tend, in the first half of life, to “overtake conscious subjectivity with ideas, moods, and habits” that seem to be “autonomous”.<sup>90</sup> In other words, one becomes the “puppet” of one’s unconsciously held complexes and agendas.

As long as parental complexes remain the unquestioned structures on which ‘reality’ is situated, either through identifying with them or through projecting them onto others (including the actual parents), a person is unable to become a

---

<sup>86</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 135.

<sup>87</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 96–97.

<sup>88</sup> Haule, “Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions,” 153.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 153–54.

<sup>90</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, 27.

psychological individual—one capable of self-reflection, personal responsibility, and personal meaning.<sup>91</sup>

Human development is a process of growth and learning. Individuation is a process “by which archetypes intervene in and educate the ego” due to the compensatory relationship between consciousness and the “superior and better guide” of the unconscious,<sup>92</sup> and, according to Singer, it is marked by these attributes:

(1) the goal of the process is the development of the personality; (2) it presupposes and includes collective relationships, i.e., it does not occur in a state of isolation; [and,] (3) individuation involves a degree of opposition to social norms which have no absolute validity: [Jung notes that] ‘The more a man’s life is shaped by the collective norm, the greater is his individual immorality.’<sup>93</sup>

The process of individuation does not lead one to a solipsistic soliloquy of self-containment.

Instead, becoming “an indivisible unity, a particular, single, and unique person” allows one to be in relationship with others. “Jung insists,” write the Ulanovs,

that such individuality is built only on hard fact and experience. Only such really individual persons can create genuine community with others, because someone is really there constructing relationship to those around him. Pseudo individuals provide only surface adaptation to others. Once trouble comes or a chance for real intimacy is made available, panic sets in; their underlying vacuity sucks up into its own emptiness whatever the other person might offer. No mutuality is possible, because only a sham person is there. Only the person growing toward his own individuality can glimpse the truth that all people have the same kind of inner life and the same kind of urge to become unique, unified, and whole persons.<sup>94</sup>

Being in real relationship with others seems to be in short supply in modern America. Yet the good news not only for those suffering from the effects of alienation, loneliness, or adverse childhood experiences but for every one of us is that the psyche is intrinsically self-healing and uses the process of individuation to achieve greater wholeness and psychic health. “If the ego is

---

<sup>91</sup> Ibid.

<sup>92</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 30.

<sup>93</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 355–56.

<sup>94</sup> Ann Belford Ulanov and Barry Ulanov, *Religion and the Unconscious* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985), 37.

damaged by traumatic events, or has evolved in too fragile a manner,” notes Kalsched, “then the unconscious will compensate and provide positive energies. Conversely, an over-strong ego, too confident in its limited powers, will find itself facing tremendous and perhaps horrifying opposition from below.”<sup>95</sup> Although it can be a “difficult and perilous path”<sup>96</sup> where “inadequate patterns” die<sup>97</sup> and may feel like a “via crucis,”<sup>98</sup> individuation is a “teleological process” wherein the limited ego consciousness learns to “bow” to the more widely perspectival Self “to develop an ever-deeper relationship with the mythical, numinous forces of the unconscious in order to make it a journey of meaning and value.”<sup>99</sup> According to Singer

Individuation can attach a sense of worth to the lives of those who suffer because they are unable or unwilling to measure up to collective norms and collective ideals. To those who are not recognized by the collective, who are rejected and even despised, this process offers a way toward restoring faith in themselves as they establish their own inner values. It may give them back their human dignity and assure them of their place in the world. [Others who are successful by worldly standards] are aware that there are untapped resources in the psyche as well as in the world, and they seek access to the riches of the unconscious. For they know that they are more than their image in the world.<sup>100</sup>

Yet Bulkeley cautions us not to conclude that we must reject consciousness in favor of unconscious guidance at every turn. No, the “vital task” of consciousness is to “understand” and “actualize the contents that rise up from the unconscious—neither controlling nor surrendering to those contents but integrating them into a broader, more balanced conscious self-awareness.”<sup>101</sup> Haule calls the Self a “trickster sage” and notes that Neumann warned that its tempting and anti-establishment Voice “must always be listened to—though not always followed” because it is

---

<sup>95</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 30.

<sup>96</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 157.

<sup>97</sup> Sylvia Brinton Perera, “The Descent of Inanna: Myth and Therapy,” in *Feminist Archetypal Theory: Interdisciplinary Re-Visions of Jungian Thought*, ed. Estella Lauter and Carol Scheier Rupprecht (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 143.

<sup>98</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 117.

<sup>99</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 31.

<sup>100</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 135.

<sup>101</sup> Kelly Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997), 35.

“unpredictable, inexhaustible, and dangerous when taken seriously.”<sup>102</sup> Creativity in its most raw form is not necessarily moral, and this may be as true for Whitehead as it is for Jung. On the whole, though, individuation is a healthy process and goal that “leads to the dissolving or understanding of grandiose or devaluing childhood fantasies, identified with self or projected onto others” and that “should ultimately result in greater consciousness of the full range of conscious and unconscious impulses, actions, and symbolic meaning.”<sup>103</sup> From this more “centered” place, notes Aizenstat, we can “witness” what’s happening in the moment without being “compelled to act” and interact with the images that arise from the unconscious “more freely.”<sup>104</sup> Even more important, realizing the unifying capacity of the Self is to manifest “the highest point on the scale of objective values” where one’s symbols “can no longer be distinguished from the Imago Dei.”<sup>105</sup> With Clement of Alexandria, Jung stresses that “he who knows himself knows God.”<sup>106</sup>

In thinking about the relationship between what is “above” and what is “below,” or between the macro and the micro, we can—in a way that may be more similectic than ontologically comparative—imagine Jung’s thought described above as the macro level and Whitehead’s thought as the micro level. For example, at Jung’s macro level of the human being, a person in the process of individuation brings unconscious material to consciousness for consideration and integration; at Whitehead’s micro level of the moment of experience, an entity in the process of concrescence uses its supplemental phases to bring unconscious propositions and propositional feelings to intellectual feelings for consideration and integration. At

---

<sup>102</sup> Haule, “Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions,” 154.

<sup>103</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, 27.

<sup>104</sup> Stephen Aizenstat, *Dream Tending: Awakening to the Healing Power of Dreams* (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2011), 30.

<sup>105</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 69.

<sup>106</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 239.



Whitehead's micro level, "the many become one and are increased by one," an idea that may, at first, seem oppositional to Jung's idea that the distinct individual arises from undifferentiated wholeness and then returns to wholeness. But in Whitehead, this is not a linear process with a clear and distinct beginning in either unity or differentiation; it is much more circular in nature. On Whitehead's micro level, the individual entity is constituted by its relationships with others, and encounters those objective others within itself. It then decides what it will be in its own solitude, and, upon perishing as a subjective unity, is again in relationship with the rest of the world. Similarly, on Jung's macro level, the human person is formed through its relationship with the unconscious, integrates his or her own experiences within him/herself, and, as an integrated, whole person, can then enter into truly intimate relationships with others. In the next section, we will see how this encounter with the unconscious at the depths of the psyche is truly—as at Whitehead's micro level—an encounter with an objective Other.

## **THE DEPTHS OF EXPERIENCE: PRIMORDIAL LIFE AND OBJECTIVE PSYCHE**

Evocative of Whitehead's "living immediacy" and *creativity*, Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung both described a psychological reality where the human encounters that "original strata of human life" or the "rushing river of being"<sup>107</sup> that flows through one in a torrent of unconscious, active, generative life. Freud called this *primary-process thinking* and Jung called it *non-directed thinking*, and for both it is primordial human experience. Ann and Barry Ulanov call it "inexhaustible,

an eternal flow of life in its most elemental forms coursing beneath all the modulated actions, rational intentions, and measured involvements with one another that we may erect above it. This first and foremost process in our thinking

---

<sup>107</sup> Ulanov and Ulanov, *Religion and the Unconscious*, 13, 26.

and feeling history is eternal, unconscious, infantile life, as Freud sees it. Out of it all other kinds of mental life evolve. It is a raw form of life that may sweep us ruthlessly away if we fall into it, yet may also bring our consciousness into fertile productivity if we can find ways to channel its endless flow.<sup>108</sup>

This level of the psyche holds great riches and it is essential to one's experience of life, vitality and creativity to be in ongoing relationship with it. For Jung, individuals flourish by being in dynamic relationship with the unconscious, through bringing unconscious material to consciousness and integrating that material over one's lifetime into a whole personality. The personal unconscious, formed by family relationships and personal experience, explains Rowland, is a "lesser aspect" of the unconscious proper, yet very real.

Whatever the person considers to be 'real' is also, by definition, psychic. Consequently, the definition of the Jungian unconscious stresses that it is immediate and crucial to everyday experience. Jungian ideas differ significantly from Freudian psychoanalysis in seeking to honor the unconscious rather than fearing it. The Jungian unconscious is conceptually far superior to the ego: it is the source of meaning, feeling and the possibility of finding value in human life.<sup>109</sup>

Unconscious material is brought to consciousness by working with the images that arise in dreams (and through other kinds of inner work); such images are thought to be mediated by the archetypal Self, the God-image in the psyche. The Self is understood as a pattern of wholeness in the psyche, and is both the process of building the personality and its *telos*. Those images that lure us toward the wholeness of the Self serve a purpose similar to that of the initial aims and propositions that lure Whitehead's entities toward realization of novel possibilities. According to Ann Ulanov and Alvin Dueck, through the Self, we encounter the "living God" that "[gives us] food from the heart of reality."<sup>110</sup> She notes that "The unconscious communicates through the body, both individually and corporately, through affect-laden images that picture

---

<sup>108</sup> Ibid., 26.

<sup>109</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 29.

<sup>110</sup> Ulanov and Dueck, *The Living God and Our Living Psyche*, 69.

instincts, the thrumming of the mysterious gift of life itself ... We have pictures that rise up in us autonomously, spontaneously because that is the psyche's language."<sup>111</sup> As will be explained in Chapter 5 using the work of Earnest Hartmann, brain activity in what is called the default mode network (DMN) reflects such non-directed thinking. Although primordial experience or non-directed thinking may be "alarming" and show us "dark and hateful things," these "psychic depths are nature, and nature is creative life."<sup>112</sup> In seeing the "created world" as a "creating principle,"<sup>113</sup> Singer resonates with Whitehead's understanding of the very creative process at the base of actuality. This creative process is transpersonal and, when encountered, carries the kind of sacred authority that Otto describes in numinous experience; yet rather than speculating about a transcendent God, Jung spoke of God as an image—a "living mystery"<sup>114</sup>—in the psyche that was yet this "'Numinosum,' this totally 'Other.'"<sup>115</sup> In the previous chapter on Whitehead, we examined the "weft" of the Beginnings of Experience and discovered the living immediacy of the present moment and the dead factual past; we also examined the "warp" of Transpersonal Reality and discovered a dipolar God, mutual immanence, and novelty. In this chapter on Jung, we examined the "weft" of the Depths of Experience and discovered primordial life and the objective psyche; next we will examine the "warp" of Transpersonal Reality in order to discover the collective unconscious, the God-image in the psyche, and the archetypal imagination.

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 72.

<sup>112</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 215.

<sup>113</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 378.

<sup>114</sup> Clodagh Weldon, "God on the Couch: Teaching Jung's Answer to Job," in *Teaching Jung*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, AAR Teaching Religious Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 118.

<sup>115</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 384.

**TRANSPERSONAL REALITY:  
COLLECTIVE UNCONSCIOUS, ARCHETYPAL IMAGINATION  
AND THE GOD-IMAGE**

**Collective Unconscious**

In *Ego and Archetype*, Edward F. Edinger claims that Jung's "most basic and far-reaching discovery is the collective unconscious or archetypal psyche."<sup>116</sup> One key difference between Freud and Jung is that whereas Freud believed the powerful unconscious forces that often disrupted human life were merely the repressed contents of individual experience, Jung's clinical observations led him to conclude that there was a transpersonal or "pre-personal"<sup>117</sup> nature to the broader unconscious because he noted that very similar "myth motifs" and images emerged in disparate cultures and places across the globe. He found these "mythologems" to be "independent of tradition" and to carry a nearly "universal parallelism."<sup>118</sup>

Jung found through his clinical research that these common images were not the result of "merely forgotten or repressed material," but that "typical mythologems were observed among individuals to whom all knowledge of this kind absolutely was out of the question, and where indirect derivation from religious ideas that might have been known to them, or from popular figures of speech was impossible."<sup>119</sup> He believed that this collective "psychic system" did not develop individually in humans but was "inherited,"<sup>120</sup> "common to all humanity,"<sup>121</sup> and was a

---

<sup>116</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 3.

<sup>117</sup> Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 98–100.

<sup>119</sup> Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 156.

<sup>121</sup> Robert J. Hoss, "Evidence of Wisdom in Dreams" (Annual Conference of the International Association for the Study of Dreams, Asheville, NC, 2010).

“deeper stratum”<sup>122</sup> of the unconscious. In 1959, Jung described the collective unconscious in this way:

A more or less superficial layer of the unconscious is undoubtedly personal. I call it the *personal unconscious*. But this personal unconscious rests upon a deeper layer, which does not derive from personal experience and is not a personal acquisition but is inborn. This deeper layer I call the *collective unconscious*. I have chosen the term ‘collective’ because this part of the unconscious is not individual but universal; in contrast to the personal psyche, it has contents and modes of behavior that are more or less the same everywhere and in all individuals. It is, in other words, identical in all [humans] and thus constitutes a common psychic substrate of a suprapersonal nature which is present in every one of us.<sup>123</sup>

In other words, the kinds of basic behaviors and emotions that humans typically display (laughter, shame, a sense of self) do not have to be reinvented in every individual person. It is because humans have been engaged upon the same “vital problems,” generation after generation, that the “universal, collective matrix out of which we all live” manifests itself in “instinctual actions and their accompanying emotions.”<sup>124</sup> Robertson describes it this way:

There are as many archetypes as there are typical situations in life. Endless repetition has engraved these experiences into our psychic constitution, not in the form of images filled with content, but at first only as *forms without content*, representing merely the possibility of a certain type of perception and action. When a situation occurs which corresponds to a given archetype, that archetype becomes activated and a compulsiveness appears, which, like an instinctual drive, gains its way against all reason and will, or else produces a conflict of pathological dimensions, that is to say, a neurosis.<sup>125</sup>

For Jung, it was an observed fact of life that “certain ideas exist almost everywhere and at all times” that were not “made by the individual, they just happen to him”; Jung saw this not as “Platonic philosophy” but as “empirical psychology.”<sup>126</sup> Archetypes are “remembered patterns”

---

<sup>122</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 28.

<sup>123</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 359.

<sup>124</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 50–51.

<sup>125</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 167.

<sup>126</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 585.

from generations of ancestral experience of commonly encountered situations<sup>127</sup> into which present-day experiences of the living individual “fall” so as to be “given shape”<sup>128</sup>.

Kelsey describes a compelling (and frequently cited) experience Jung had with a young schizophrenic patient of a mental hospital, who had been confined there for most of his life.

The man—a clerk with limited education, who had been in the mental hospital in Zurich for years—stopped Jung in the corridor one day and asked him to look at the sun. Jung was interested and noted his instructions, ‘Hold your head this way, and you will see the tube hanging down, swinging back and forth and that is the source of the wind.’ It was a spontaneous vision with an eerie quality. But a few years later Jung was startled into awareness. He was reading an obscure work by a learned philologist; there, in a language his patient had never known, was a translation of almost precisely the same vision, even to the words. It came from an ancient magic papyrus which had lain unedited for years in the Bibliotheque Nationale in Paris. This kind of experience was repeated several times during his practice, often connected in some unaccountable way with an associated outer event.<sup>129</sup>

In relating the same historical anecdote, Robertson notes the origination of the vision as from a Mithraic sun-ritual to which Jung’s patient could never have been exposed. “The most likely hypothesis Jung could propose” for the patient’s vision, writes Robertson, “was that the patient somehow tapped a collective memory...either the patient somehow became aware of an ancient Mithraic ritual and incorporated it into his delusions, or he is drawing on some knowledge that he didn’t acquire in his lifetime.” Moreover, the patient’s use of this metaphor was not random but purposeful, as he “wanted to initiate Jung into religious mysteries.”<sup>130</sup>

Support for the existence of the collective unconscious has also come through the study of language. A report from 1969 noted that scientists had discovered what was described as a “symbolic machinery, common to all [people]” that had been used prior to the emergence of

---

<sup>127</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 167.

<sup>128</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 101.

<sup>129</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 113.

<sup>130</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 158–59.

formal language to communicate about basic human concerns, such as “birth, life, death, love, combat and fear of the elements, which are common to both animals and men.”<sup>131</sup> Singer writes

According to a report headed ‘Language study indicates collective unconscious exists,’ Joseph Jaffe, M.D., is willing to admit that ‘the existence of a collective unconscious common to all men is quite believable when translated into terms of recent studies on the foundation of language.’<sup>132</sup>

Jung saw the collective unconscious as something like “an unceasing stream or perhaps an ocean of images and figures which drift into consciousness in our dreams or in abnormal states of mind.”<sup>133</sup> Singer likens the relationship of consciousness to the unconscious as an island that emerges “from the great sea...with the rim of wet sand encircling each island corresponding to the ‘personal unconscious.’ But it is the collective unconscious—the sea—that is the birthplace of all consciousness, and from there the old ideas arise anew, and their connections with contemporary situations are initiated.”<sup>134</sup> Lest we imagine this collective unconscious as only a source of “old ideas,” Shelburne notes that “completely new thoughts and creative ideas can also present themselves from the unconscious.”<sup>135</sup> Singer describes its presence in us as “a microcosm within the macrocosm. The exploration of this world is more challenging than the exploration of outer space, and the journey to inner space is not necessarily an easy or a safe trip.”<sup>136</sup> The unconscious is “unknowable,” “primary” and “the paramount reality, the unknowable ‘ground.’ What the conscious self ‘knows’ or believes to be true is continually undercut by the unconscious other.”<sup>137</sup> The unconscious comes to us as “other” and “speaks with authority.”<sup>138</sup> Again, it seems that Jung’s collective unconscious evokes Whitehead’s dipolar

---

<sup>131</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 121.

<sup>132</sup> Ibid., 122.

<sup>133</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 186.

<sup>134</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 373–74.

<sup>135</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 29.

<sup>136</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 104.

<sup>137</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 143.

<sup>138</sup> Haule, “Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions,” 152.

God, both in God's primordial and consequent natures. Much more will be said on this in Chapter 6. Now we will turn to the products of this transpersonal and collective reality and the effects it produces—the archetypes and their images.

### **Archetypes and Archetypal Images**

While Jung believed that the personal unconscious contained mostly the “feeling-toned complexes,” the collective unconscious contains the archetypes,<sup>139</sup> or “organizing principles.”<sup>140</sup> Because of his repeated observations of patients who related psychic contents with common myth motifs independent of their personal experience or history, Jung concluded that these contents did not originate in the “space-time world or the individual consciousness.” He was compelled, then, to assume that he was “dealing with ‘myth-forming’ structural elements in the unconscious psyche which produced out of themselves revivals of these mythologems, independent of all tradition.”<sup>141</sup> Jung called these structural elements *archetypes*, meaning “a pre-existent form...[an] organizing principle in the collective unconscious.” He drew the term from historical references, including Philo Judaeus’ usage of it in relation to the “*Imago Dei* (God-Image) in man,” and Irenaeus, who wrote “‘The creator of the world did not fashion these things directly from himself but copied them from archetypes outside himself.’”<sup>142</sup>

As described earlier, the organizing archetype in the psyche is the Self. Because Jung observed that the Self archetype sometimes manifests in dreams via animal symbols, he speculated—again evoking Whitehead’s dipolar entities—that archetypes possess both an “instinctive, body-based pole” as well as a “spiritual pole.”<sup>143</sup> Kelsey describes them as breaking

---

<sup>139</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 359.

<sup>140</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 133.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 100.

<sup>142</sup> *Ibid.*, 126–27, 133.

<sup>143</sup> Ann Belford Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent* (Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1996), 20.



into consciousness with a numinous attractiveness that was difficult to explain, and with a power that changed the course of a [person's] life. Often they were combined with elements from the personal unconscious, or at times they broke in on their own with almost no personal content at all...evidence [about these elements and their effect] showed Jung that the unconscious contains other forces besides the destructive, or simply primitive and inferior ones. He was forced to recognize that there are also creative contents that break in upon [individuals] through the unconscious which are superior to human consciousness.<sup>144</sup>

Hoss describes archetypes as “collective forces and patterns from within.”<sup>145</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall describe Jung’s important contribution to the theory of human instincts to be his addition of “image” to the general human experience of “emotional or situational patterns.” Jung’s archetypes indicate “a universal predisposition to construct an image, usually in an emotionally aroused state”; they function to organize “emotion and image into universal forms...Archetypes arise in human experience and are universal because certain configurations of emotion are ubiquitous in human life.”<sup>146</sup> They are

preverbal in their first occurrence, and because they are infused with emotion, archetypal images are powerfully motivating and continue to be organizers of psychological experiences (especially in relationships with others) throughout life. Moreover, their meanings cannot be fully encompassed by language and rational forms of thought.<sup>147</sup>

Because they are unconscious, archetypes are not directly observable; they have no content that can be “represented to the mind” but “only manifest themselves through their ability to *organize* images and ideas, and this is always an unconscious process which cannot be detected until afterwards.”<sup>148</sup> They manifest as the symbols and images that arise in dreams and spontaneous fantasies of the mind, and these symbols and images “lead us from the known to the unknown, as we seek to better understand ourselves.”<sup>149</sup> The differentiation between the

---

<sup>144</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 113.

<sup>145</sup> Hoss, “Evidence of Wisdom in Dreams.”

<sup>146</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, 1–2.

<sup>147</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>148</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 128.

<sup>149</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 133.

archetype and its image is given shape for students in Clodagh Weldon's classes through a demonstration she typically performs in which she hides a large magnet under a sheet of paper and then shakes iron filings onto it. A student for whom the magnet's presence is unknown is subsequently asked to tap the sheet of paper so all may observe the pattern or image "that reveals the magnetic field" and illustrates the formative power of an unconscious archetype.<sup>150</sup> The archetypal image is both an image "in its own right" and a "*dynamism* which makes itself felt" in its "numinosity and fascinating power."<sup>151</sup>

### Archetypal Value and Synchronicity

In process thought, because every forming entity is, to some degree, a subject that feels and experiences its world and the influences upon it, process thought understands the cosmos as *panexperiential*. In the same way that Whitehead understands human consciousness as something that naturally emerges from its roots in beings of lesser complexity, Jung understands that everything in the universe "has a psychelike quality, a capacity for responsiveness." This is the basis of his theory of synchronicity, a principle that he adds to the three universal principles of gravity, electromagnetism, and quantum uncertainty.<sup>152</sup> As Jung began to investigate what he called "synchronistic phenomena," writes Card, he had "discovered that archetypes consistently act as the mediating principle that accounts for the meaningfulness of the coincidental mental and physical events."<sup>153</sup> Therefore, archetypes go beyond a "neurophysical basis" alone and impact the "general dynamical patterns of all matter and energy."<sup>154</sup> Jung thought this possible because he posited a *unus mundus*, or "unitary existence that underlies the duality of the mind

---

<sup>150</sup> Weldon, "God on the Couch," 119.

<sup>151</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 103–4.

<sup>152</sup> Haule, "Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions," 161.

<sup>153</sup> Card, "The Archetypal View of C.G. Jung and Wolfgang Pauli," 27.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*

(psyche) and matter (physis).” Again evoking Whitehead’s ontological theory of one reality, Jung wrote that multiplicity and unity are not two different worlds existing “side-by-side” or “mingled with one another,” but that archetypes are the mediating factors of the entire *unus mundus*. “When operating in the realm of *psyche*, [archetypes] are the dynamical organizers of images and ideas; when operating in the realm of *physis*, they are the patterning principles of matter and energy” and responsible for “acausal orderedness.”<sup>155</sup> Jung developed these ideas on synchronicity while working with physicist Wolfgang Pauli, one of the founders of quantum theory.<sup>156</sup>

He ultimately saw archetypes as “autonomous patterns of meaning that appear to structure and inhere in both psyche and matter, thereby in effect dissolving the modern subject-object dichotomy.” Drawing from Richard Tarnas, Maxwell notes that the “ultimate philosophical implication of Jungian synchronicity (as opposed to the psychological implications...) is that formal causality must be reinstated as a valid form of causation if our experience is to be understood in all of its multivalence.”<sup>157</sup> An uncanny resonance between Whitehead’s eternal objects and Jung’s archetypes is apparent when we examine two independent passages about mathematics. In *Science and the Modern World*, Whitehead ponders Pythagorus’ question on the “status of mathematical entities,” pointing specifically to the number two and noting that such a number is both “involved in the real world” *and* “exempt from the flux of time.” He concludes that such formal elements as number and shape are what lie “at the base of the real world.”<sup>158</sup> In an eerily similar way, Marie-Louise von Franz, an analyst and student of Jung, writes in *Man and His Symbols* (a text edited by Jung just prior to his death in

---

<sup>155</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>157</sup> Maxwell, “Archetype and Eternal Object,” 65.

<sup>158</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World* (New York: The Free Press, 1967), 27–28.

1961) that the number two illustrates how numbers “are not concepts consciously invented by [humans] for purposes of calculation: They are spontaneous and autonomous products of the unconscious—as are other archetypal symbols.” Yet such numbers “adhere” to objects in the space-time world.

Even if we strip outer objects of all such qualities as color, temperature, size, etc.,” she notes, “there still remains their ‘many-ness’ or special multiplicity. Yet these same numbers are also just as indisputably part of our own mental set-up—abstract concepts that we can study without looking at outer objects. Numbers thus appear to be a tangible connection between the spheres of matter and psyche.”<sup>159</sup>

Resonant with Whitehead, Haule describes Jung’s universe as “not a collection of unrelated elements but ordered as an internally responsive organism, a nested hierarchy of psychoid components.” Such a psychoid universe “cannot enjoy the status of ‘absolute truth,’ for that does not exist,” writes Haule. Instead, its truth is a “mythic truth,” and to accept a psychoid universe is “a mythic-metaphysical leap by which the Gordian knot of the body-mind or matter-soul problem is sliced through with the declaration that soul and consciousness are not limited to *Homo sapiens* but in some form or other go ‘all the way down’ to what mainstream science and philosophy call (with no better justification) dead, inert matter.”<sup>160</sup> Our tour through Jung’s transpersonal reality has revealed a dynamic process of psychic encounters with both objective other and immanent God-image that present organizing forms and patterns that are filled with contextualized images that lure us toward unique expressions of value in a meaning- and value-soaked world to which we matter and within which we belong. Moreover, such encounters may grace us with their transformative and healing powers.

---

<sup>159</sup> Marie-Louise von Franz, “Conclusion: Science and the Unconscious,” in *Man and His Symbols*, ed. C. G. Jung (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), 310.

<sup>160</sup> Haule, “Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions,” 163.

## God and the Healing Power of the Unconscious

Jung saw God as an experience and not a concept, as an “immanent presence, a state of being in which thinking and feeling are unified and grounded, in a sense of one’s immediate participation in the divine.”<sup>161</sup> John P. Dourley, Roman Catholic priest, Jungian analyst and professor emeritus at Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada, has done extensive comparative work on Paul Tillich and Jung. He writes in *Psyche as Sacrament* that both Jung and Tillich understood their work to be “in the defense and service of the religious nature of [humans].”<sup>162</sup> Jung, Dourley writes, “hoped to provide the Christian with a deeper appreciation of his [or her] own symbols by demonstrating their source in the deeper reaches of the psyche” and notes that both men believed that seeing the encounter with God as an inner experience in a way that could restore the meaning of religion would only happen if the human could “regain [his or her] experience of [him/herself] as an image of God.”<sup>163</sup> He continues,

In the debate between modern theologies that would deny a natural continuity between the divine and the human, and those that would base their conception of religious man upon such a continuity, Tillich and Jung clearly align themselves with the latter. To understand [humans’] relation to God in any other way is to place God as a being wholly beyond [humans] and to conceive of [God] as addressing or entering human life wholly from beyond it. Such intrusive revelations are experienced by their recipients as emanating from a source foreign to life, and tend to split rather than heal the life and consciousness they invade. Tillich and Jung seek to heal this breach by proposing a dialectical unity between [one’s] sense of [self] as autonomous and God’s approach to [him or her] as a power transcendent to [his or her] humanity but not discreetly separable from it.<sup>164</sup>

For Jung, what one encountered in religious experience was what he also called “primordial experience,” and he felt that this experience could not be experientially

---

<sup>161</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 113.

<sup>162</sup> John P. Dourley, *The Psyche As Sacrament: A Comparative Study of C.G. Jung and Paul Tillich* (Toronto: Inner City Books, 1981), 7.

<sup>163</sup> Ibid., 7–8.

<sup>164</sup> Ibid., 9.

differentiated from what the religious traditions called “God” or “original Mystery.” Primordial experience bursts upon one’s consciousness with suddenness and great power and a kind of blazing intensity. Religion, Jung believed, was a “true container” for such primordial experience and that it balanced and integrated the human’s relationship to it in two ways: (1) One can be carried away by the intensity of primordial experience and fall into “the abyss” never to return, and so religion provides a container within which to understand the experience through the community’s tradition and texts; and, (2) It can protect a person’s individuality and autonomy by giving them an “extramundane” authority and referent, to prevent humans from becoming “mass-minded.” Unfortunately, some expressions of religion seem as likely to demand conformity as the State that Jung so frequently targeted for critique.

On the one hand, Jung felt that none of his “reflections” could touch the “essence” of God because of the limitations of human conception and the “feebleness and poverty of language”; on the other hand, he understood the archetypal “emotional foundation” of numinous experience to be “unassailable by reason” and as “psychic fact.”<sup>165</sup> As Rowland notes, “Religious experience in Jungian ideas (in total contrast to Freudian theory...) is genuine and authentic.”<sup>166</sup> After his own “breakthrough experience,” Jung wrote, “Suddenly, I understood that God was for me at least one of the most certain and immediate experiences of life.”<sup>167</sup>

Yet its authenticity is that of the archetype, not of somehow ‘proving’ an official religious doctrine. The sense of the divine is always archetypal, of the collective unconscious. It may be a manifestation of an exterior and transcendent god working through the unconscious (because all reality is psychic), or it may merely be the unconscious representing itself. There is no way to tell the difference.<sup>168</sup>

---

<sup>165</sup> C. G. Jung, *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Corrected, vol. 11, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series (New York: Pantheon Books, 1963), 361.

<sup>166</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 33.

<sup>167</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 113.

<sup>168</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 33.

Though he did not necessarily equate the collective unconscious with what Christians would call “God,” they are “empirically indistinguishable”<sup>169</sup> and Jung understood experiences of the “numinous” as arising from its psychic depths. As Walter Shelburne quotes Jung,

This is certainly not to say that what we call the unconscious is identical with God or is set up in his place. It is simply the medium from which religious experience seems to flow...The idea of God is an absolutely necessary psychological function of an irrational nature, which has nothing whatever to do with the question of God's existence. The human intellect can never answer this question, still less give any proof of God. Moreover, such proof is superfluous, for the idea of an all-powerful divine Being is present everywhere, unconsciously if not consciously, because it is an archetype. There is in the psyche some superior power, and if it is not consciously a god, it is the ‘belly’ at least, in St. Paul's words... The existence of God is once and for all an unanswerable question.... We find numberless images of God, but we cannot produce the original. There is no doubt in my mind that there is an original behind our images, but it is inaccessible...All that I have learned has led me step by step to an unshakable conviction of the existence of God. I only believe in what I know. And that eliminates believing. Therefore I do not take His existence on belief—I *know* that He exists.<sup>170</sup>

Drawing from Elaine Pagels, McGehee notes similar positions held by both modern psychotherapy and Gnostic Christianity—in contrast to orthodox Christianity—that

the psyche bears *within itself* the potential for liberation or destruction. Few psychiatrists would disagree with the saying attributed to Jesus in the Gospel of Thomas, ‘If you bring forth what is within you, what you bring forth will save you. If you do not bring forth what is within you, what you do not bring forth will destroy you.’<sup>171</sup>

Bringing forth what is within you is the very nature of the collective unconscious working through the Self. As Rowland reminds us, the unconscious has “healing sublime powers”<sup>172</sup> working within us for our greater aliveness and wholeness. If every human psyche bears both liberation and destruction within itself, and if the healing power of the unconscious is also

---

<sup>169</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 165.

<sup>170</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 76–77.

<sup>171</sup> Elaine Pagels, *The Gnostic Gospels*, Reissue (New York: Vintage, 1989), xv.

<sup>172</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 148.

collectively available, then we are confronted again with the wounding and healing of reality in its ever-present dipolar dance.

## **SUMMARY**

Jung's analytical psychology was developed through empirical observations of his patients as well as his own deep dives into the unconscious. For him, as for Whitehead, experience must be both the departure point and terminus of any theoretical flights. Therefore, based on his observations, Jung describes a psyche that is both conscious and unconscious, one in which directed ego-thinking is but the "spotlight" in contrast to the non-directed thinking that is the "floodlight" through which we illumine the primordial dynamism and vitality available to us universally as embodied human beings. In Jung's system, mind, body, and world are interrelated and archetypal meaning is the lattice structure in which psyche, matter, and image all cohere. Individuals—even as opposing intrapsychic energies result in persona, neurosis, and trauma—are capable of individuating toward psychic integration and wholeness through the numinous images of the archetypal Self. Such a process results in greater aliveness and inner authority, more intimate relationships with others, and more individuality and value returned to the world. As it is the primary language of both the unconscious and the process of individuation, it is time now to turn to the practical resources for this project—dreams and dream-related research.



## CHAPTER 5:

### PRACTICAL: THE INTEGRATIVE POWER OF DREAMS

#### INTRODUCTION

##### Practical Purposes

To this point, I have shown how Whitehead's integrated and relational cosmos and Jung's integrated and relational psyche provide resources more than adequate to the task of human wholeness and flourishing. Whitehead's metaphysical framework and Jung's psychological system both point to a reality wherein individuals have value, are related to God and world, and can experience positive change. Yet even with this abundance of intellectual riches, we know that Bulkeley and Zimmerman would remind us that taking only a cognitive turn away from a dualistic and alienating worldview toward a more life-enhancing worldview is not enough. We must find a way to facilitate transformative *experiences* of the kind of nondual consciousness that reveal a world of value, relatedness, and transformation.

Value, belonging, and transformation must take center stage if our lived experience is to reflect anything other than meaninglessness, alienation, and suffering. We must, therefore, also offer practical resources that *work within* our metaphysical and psychological frameworks to facilitate such experiences. I will show in this chapter that a practice of spiritual dream work that recognizes the potential for at least some of our dreams to be healing religious or mystical encounters can foster psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing when interpreted as a meeting place between transpersonal reality and embodied existence. To reach that destination, we will briefly examine dreams and dreaming from a psychological view, a scientific view, a communal view, and a mystical view.

## Dreams in Context

From all appearances, to be human is to dream. Bulkeley indicates that “humans have been fascinated, intrigued, and perplexed by their dreams” and mused on their origination for millennia; dreams have been recorded in “some of the oldest texts ever discovered.”<sup>1</sup> Dreams have also had a significant impact on culture, science, and technology. In *Dreaming in Church*, Presbyterian minister Geoff Nelson points to five cultural and technological breakthroughs in which dreams played a significant part, including Eastman’s advances in film technology, Kekule’s work on the benzene ring, Einstein’s theory of relativity, Handel’s *Messiah*, and Howe’s invention of the sewing machine.<sup>2</sup> Ironically, the very dualistic system on which this project lays much of the blame for our current state of alienation and division was inspired in Descartes by a series of three dreams he had in November of 1619 which led him “from chaos to clarity.” Yet, as Kelsey notes, in Descartes’ view of himself and all other human subjects as “pure consciousness, or rational intellect” he “excluded the source of his own inspiration,” leaving us with the splitting effects of that “intellectual blunder” ever since.<sup>3</sup> Bulkeley underscores the blunder in his own way when he writes that

Classical dualism of the type often attributed to René Descartes does not help to explain the many ways that physical changes in the brain can impact the conscious experience of the mind. But materialist efforts to explain consciousness in purely physical terms never seem to get very far. This is especially evident in the field of dream research, where brainstem reductionists have been unable to give anything close to a convincing explanation of how all the different dimensions of brain activity during sleep—including electrical, chemical, anatomical, and cognitive factors, along with the influences of gender, age,

---

<sup>1</sup> Kelly Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997), 2; Kelly Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night: Dreams, Religion and Psychology* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999), 23.

<sup>2</sup> Geoff Nelson, *Dreaming in Church: Dream Work as a Spiritual Practice for Christians* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016), 3.

<sup>3</sup> Morton T. Kelsey, *Encounter With God: A Theology of Christian Experience* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 73.

interpersonal relations, and cultural context—add up to the multisensory experience of a dream.<sup>4</sup>

Our rationally-skewed culture tends to dismiss the value of dreams. This dismissal is identified by Jung as “but one symptom of a far more serious undervaluation of the human psyche in general” and reflects an “appalling lack of wisdom and introspection.”<sup>5</sup> Yet we often disregard what we cannot pin down into neat categories.

Such has not been true in the religious arena. Because dreams have always seemed mysterious, arriving without conscious will or intention, Bulkeley notes that there is a “broad historical and cross-cultural consensus” among world religions that dreams refer to religious realities.<sup>6</sup> Dreams have maintained a prominent position in religious traditions because they are typically seen as “a means of relating to the sacred, to those powers and realities that transcend ordinary human existence.”<sup>7</sup> Yet the rise of “secularization”—what Bulkeley describes as “the process by which modern scientific, economic, and cultural forces have combined to vanquish the authority of religion in Western society”—has ushered in a transition from “a religious to a psychological view of dreams” where psychologists have become the new authorities on their significance.<sup>8</sup> In the remainder of this chapter, we will examine dreams from several viewpoints: 1) a *psychological* view of dreams, focusing on the Jungian tradition; 2) a *scientific* view of dreams, focusing on research in the cognitive sciences; 3) a *communal* view of dreams and the rise of dream-sharing groups; and, 4) a *mystical* view of dreams that accepts at least some dreams as the meeting place between transpersonal reality and embodied existence—or dreams

---

<sup>4</sup> Kelly Bulkeley, *Big Dreams: The Science of Dreaming and the Origins of Religion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), 100.

<sup>5</sup> C. G. Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, ed. Violet Staub De Laszlo, Reprint (New York: Modern Library, 1993), 597.

<sup>6</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 23.

<sup>7</sup> Kelly Bulkeley, “Dream-Sharing Groups, Spirituality, and Community,” *Journal of Religion and Health* 35, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 62.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

as religious experience. I will show that the integration of these four perspectives allows us to situate dream work as a practical resource alongside our metaphysical and psychological resources for this project because: (1) the *psychological* view connects dreams with personal *and* transpersonal meaning, value, belonging, and transformation as well as with the natural world; (2) the *scientific* view connects mental experience of dreams with the body's functioning and our perceived world and supports the psychological view of dreams and transformation; (3) the *communal* view connects dreams and dream work with shared experience, shared meaning, belonging, and transformation; and, (4) the *mystical* view connects dreams with God or transpersonal reality, as well as with meaning, value, belonging, and transformation.

## A PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEW OF DREAMS

Great advances in the study of human nature as related to dreaming have been made by the psychological sciences since the release in 1899 of Freud's seminal work *The Interpretation of Dreams* established him as a preeminent authority on the phenomenon. Ever since, psychology has explored dream phenomena, seeing them as a "means to explore mental structures and processes that are inaccessible to normal waking awareness."<sup>9</sup> In this section, I will show how psychology—especially in the Jungian tradition—connects dreams with meaning, value, and transformation, that dreams can be seen as *natural yet purposive* and carriers of transpersonal meaning and value, and that there are specific methods and tools that can be used to understand dreams, such as *association, amplification, and active imagination or animation*.

---

<sup>9</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 2.

According to Bulkeley, dream researchers have been primarily interested in the cause of dreams, the function of dreams, the interpretation of dreams, and whether they carry meaning or are just “random nonsense”?<sup>10</sup>

By means of careful observation, experimentation, and research, psychologists have found that dreams reveal many important aspects of our mental world. The dynamics of personality, the workings of perception and memory, the interactions of reason and emotion, the complex relations between mental experiences and bodily functions—these are just some of the important subjects that psychologists have learned more about by studying dreams... The result of all this research has been nothing less than a revolution in how we view human nature. Anyone who wants to understand the essential qualities and the potentials for growth of the human mind must now take into account modern psychological research on the phenomenon of dreaming.<sup>11</sup>

Despite this revolution, Bulkeley is not enamored with the kind of simplistic approaches—endemic to religion *versus* science debates—that would pit “ancient religion” with its presumed stance that all dreams are of divine and external origin and purpose against “modern psychology” with its presumed “proof” that all dreams are merely brain-generated and therefore without any intent or meaning. It is that very “false antithesis” that he would like to “dissolve”<sup>12</sup> when he argues that most religions, in fact, view the majority of dreams as “relatively trivial and mundane” and “rooted in the ordinary concerns and experiences of daily human life.” On the other hand, there are those dreams—what in his early work he calls “divine dreams”<sup>13</sup> and later “big dreams”<sup>14</sup>—that “come with a special clarity, energy, and vividness.” Such dreams

have sparked an experience of religious conversion, opening up to [their dreamers] new realms of spiritual insight and meaning. These are the divine dream revelations that have inspired the leaders of revitalization movements, cargo cults, and new spiritual communities all over the world.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 4–5.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>12</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 24–25.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 25.

<sup>14</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*.

<sup>15</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 25.

Though Jung invoked multiple functions of dreams, Bulkeley notes two as “especially important”: (1) serving the “central process of [psychic] compensation” between the conscious ego and the unconscious—Jung’s “basic law of psychic behavior”; and, (2) “anticipating” the course of individual development or the “potentials and possibilities the dreamer’s future might hold.”<sup>16</sup> Robert J. Hoss, author of *Dream Language*, director of the Dream Science Foundation, and an officer and former president of the International Association for the Study of Dreams (IASD), describes the compensatory function in dreams as one which recognizes “misconceptions of the ego” and then attempts to “bring our awareness back to reality, and warn of the dangers of our present course.”<sup>17</sup> He relates the story of a woman who, in her waking life, anxiously and frequently tried to suppress a side of herself she considered evil. A dream vividly illustrates the compensatory function by first illuminating the viewpoint of her ego and then compensating by warning of the dangers of such a viewpoint. She “dreamed that this evil person had come alive again and [she] feared that an evil ‘entity’ was at work. [She] went through a ritual of exorcism to eliminate the entity, but the more [she] tried the darker the sky became. Suddenly a voice said, ‘stop—you are only making it worse.’”<sup>18</sup>

Hoss links a dream’s propensity to anticipate future possibilities to Jung’s “transcendent function” that works to amplify our conscious awareness with unconscious content. When recognized and integrated, such unconscious material “extend[s] the range of consciousness—[to] a field of experience of unlimited extent.” Such an expansion of awareness can initiate the emergence of a personality that is “more integrated...wider and more mature”; moreover, a new attitude may arise “whereby the unconscious and the conscious self are more integrally

---

<sup>16</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 30–31.

<sup>17</sup> Robert J. Hoss, “Evidence of a Cognitive Function within Dreams” ([www.dreamscience.org](http://www.dreamscience.org), July 2010), 1, [http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/Cognitive\\_Function\\_Dreaming-Hoss.pdf](http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/Cognitive_Function_Dreaming-Hoss.pdf).

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

connected and move together.”<sup>19</sup> Sanford describes such teleological aspects of dream functions in this way:

At this point in our knowledge it is hard to state definitely to what extent we are justified in calling the unconscious psyche ‘purposive.’ But it is clear that something unconsciously guides us into our future development, and that a human being is affected from within not only by something ‘pushing from behind,’ but also by something trying to lead into the future.<sup>20</sup>

Such researchers as Pagel, Beaulieu-Prevost, and Zadra conclude that dreaming is a phenomenon experienced by “the vast majority of the human population” even if those dreams are not always recalled. In fact, having a “negative attitude” towards dream recall can affect actual recall.<sup>21</sup> Regarding the question of whether dreams have an “intrinsic meaning,” Bulkeley shows that dream content very often reflects the “meaningful activities, concerns, and relationships in a person’s waking life.” He argues that “the *continuities* between waking and dreaming are so strong and numerous that they can often be accurately identified without any input from the dreamer, ‘blindly’ as it were.”<sup>22</sup> At the same time, the *discontinuities* that also arise are indicative of the “superabundance” of potential meanings and “possible connections with and beyond the individual’s waking life.”<sup>23</sup> To make the point that dreams “picture” different “emotional concerns in a person’s life” and can therefore have multiple layers of meaning, Ernest Hartmann relates a Talmudic tale of twenty-four different dream interpreters who gave twenty-four different interpretations, all of which were claimed as true by the dreamer.<sup>24</sup> Any meanings associated with a dream arise from the images contained therein, and so we now turn to Jung’s view of dream images.

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 2.

<sup>20</sup> John A. Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1989), 124.

<sup>21</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 93.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 127, 140.

<sup>24</sup> Ernest Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 57–58.

## Jung and Dream Images

Freud and Jung are both considered to be “deeply insightful” psychologists who conducted “pioneering” research into the nature of dreams and dreaming; yet it is Jung’s work that has been the “more influential” on contemporary dream psychology.<sup>25</sup> Like Freud, Jung did *not* see dreams as arising solely out of bodily sensations or the day’s events but believed they can reveal the ways in which the unconscious is instructing the dreamer.<sup>26</sup> As opposed to Freud’s “repressed infantile wishes and drives,” Jung believed that dream images originate “in the collective human psyche” and Singer identifies the experience of dreaming as “the clearest proof we have that the unconscious exists.”<sup>27</sup> Freud believed dreams to be made up solely of repressed sexual content and inherently deceptive; for this reason, he sought to uncover the repressed and “hidden connections between a dream image and past experience” through “free association.”<sup>28</sup> While Kelsey considers Freud’s idea that dreams are the “royal road to the unconscious” to be highly significant, he considers Freud’s view that dreams are merely a kind of “scrambled code” that only reflects what has been repressed by the individual to be too simplistic.<sup>29</sup>

Freud was a rationalist, and rationalist he remained, while Jung was an empiricist through and through. Freud assumed that the unconscious thinks rationally and wishes to communicate in this way through dreams and that it is only impeded by a censorship working quietly in the rational mind to distort these essentially rational communications. Jung, on the contrary, suggested that the unconscious does not think rationally to begin with, but rather symbolically, metaphorically, in images. And this, rather than purposeful distortion, accounts for the difficulty we have in understanding dreams.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 3.

<sup>26</sup> C. G. Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul* (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Harvest, 1955), 62–63.

<sup>27</sup> June K. Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung’s Psychology*, Revised (New York: Anchor Books, 1994), 249.

<sup>28</sup> Stephen Aizenstat, *Dream Tending: Awakening to the Healing Power of Dreams* (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2011), 15.

<sup>29</sup> Morton T. Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God* (New York: Paulist Press, 1978), 31–32.

<sup>30</sup> Morton T. Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation: A Christian Interpretation of Dreams*, Revised and Expanded (Augsburg Books, 1991), 172.



Jung developed his theories “directly out of his own personal dream experiences” and considered dreams to be “part of nature,” therefore honestly expressing “the psyche’s actual state” without disguise or deceit.<sup>31</sup> Because it is hypothesized that our conscious mind is to the entire psyche as the visible tip is to the entire iceberg, the bulk of our psychic life is unknown to us; therefore, our dreams “picture” our “inner situation,” writes Sanford, who compares the examination of a dream to “looking out of the window of a bathysphere at the wonders that exist under the sea.”<sup>32</sup> The unconscious—through dreams and other “manifestations in everyday life,” such as what Jung called “synchronicities,” or meaningful coincidences—presents us with a picture of our inner landscape or a point of view which “enlarges, completes, or compensates the conscious attitude.”<sup>33</sup> Symbols from the unconscious might “picture” obstacles blocking our growth, fears or even objections to the direction in which we are headed. While we sleep our “bathyspheric” consciousness is “immersed in the oceanic depths of the unconscious. What we see here is reality *within ourselves*.”<sup>34</sup>

Because his patients’ dream images so often resembled those found in “fairy tales, mythology, religion, and world literature” and had clearly not arisen from their personal past, Jung considered them to be “archetypal,” collectively inherited, and held by all humankind. In his later writing, he distinguished between the archetype and the archetypal image; the archetypes themselves he understood as “blueprints for images” or “inherited patterns of thought which the human mind uses to frame perceptions, experiences, and feelings.”<sup>35</sup> For Jung, symbols do not have “fixed meanings” but “reflect a natural wisdom ingrained deeply within the

---

<sup>31</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 27.

<sup>32</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language*, 104.

<sup>33</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 133, 151, 249, 406.

<sup>34</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language*, 104.

<sup>35</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 33–34.

human unconscious.” Dream symbols are “universal” or “transcendent,” but only in the sense that they “[transcend] the dreamer’s individual consciousness” and are understood *transpersonally* within entire cultures.<sup>36</sup> Jung considered both archetypes and archetypal images to be a “bequest from the past,”<sup>37</sup> capable of expressing “something of the grand story in which we live,”<sup>38</sup> and connected to every individual through the collective unconscious which he understood as “the whole evolutionary history of humankind.”<sup>39</sup>

Johnson, Kelsey, Sanford and other Jungian-influenced writers insist that dreams should not be taken literally, and caution us to “learn to look for an attitude, an inner personality, an inner development or conflict that clothes itself in the form and color of this image so that it may be *visible* to us in the Land of Dreaming.”<sup>40</sup> Dreams take the individual into “a realm of experience beyond him or herself,”<sup>41</sup> yet the unconscious will provide—if one works with the dream—the explanatory associations for every symbol, because “The unconscious contains within itself the references for every symbol that it generates; therefore, the symbolic language of the unconscious can be decoded. Our task begins with waking up to the associations that spontaneously flow out of us in response to symbols.”<sup>42</sup> But unraveling the mystery of dreams is not an easy task because modern humans have “lost touch with our capacity to think symbolically.” Yet, Kelsey writes,

dreams go right on speaking, and those who have observed them regularly find that there is a non-rational organizing function at work within [the human] psyche in addition to [our] rational consciousness. It can also be observed that psychic

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 33.

<sup>37</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 24.

<sup>38</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 16.

<sup>39</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 24.

<sup>40</sup> Robert A. Johnson, *Inner Work: Using Dreams and Active Imagination for Personal Growth* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 1989), 21.

<sup>41</sup> Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation*, 177.

<sup>42</sup> Johnson, *Inner Work*, 52.

contents have an objective, autonomous reality to them, much the same as [our] contacts with the physical world.<sup>43</sup>

Though dreams may not “make sense” to us on the surface, Johnson claims they are “completely coherent,” “masterpieces” even, of symbolic communication, the “native idiom” of the unconscious.<sup>44</sup> For Singer, dreams “lead us from the known to the unknown” and Hoss notes that the Self serves as an “inner wisdom” in dreams that initiates a process of transformation or rebirth following the death of the old ego belief.

It begins when the ego abandons the existing belief system (personal myth) that no longer works, and journeys within to find a new belief system (a new myth). At some point the organizing principle (the inner ‘Self’) begins the transformational process by first revealing the old myth (the misconceptions) and guides the dream ego, either through direct revelation or the parable of the dream story, toward a new self or new belief system (new myth). Jung indicated that in order for the transcendence to take place the dream ego must accept what is being presented by the unconscious.<sup>45</sup>

Crediting Clare Johnson with the characterization of dreams as “deep but not direct,”<sup>46</sup> Nelson goes on to say that

Dreams reveal the deepest parts of us, but they do it in ways that usually start out gentle and mild. If we are willing to work with our dreams, we may find resolution to the issue in our life the dream is trying to address. If we ignore the dream, we find we have recurring dreams that give us the same message. If we persist in ignoring the recurring dreams, the images in the dreams may become more and more frightening until the dream takes on the feelings of a nightmare. Deep parts of ourselves are revealed in our dreams.<sup>47</sup>

For Jung, the symbol is the center on which everything turns; the dream image must therefore be held in a position of primacy and respected accordingly. Its meaning “can never be grasped in terms of what the dreamer already knows,” writes Halligan, because “its very nature

---

<sup>43</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 110.

<sup>44</sup> Johnson, *Inner Work*, 20.

<sup>45</sup> Robert J. Hoss, “Evidence of Wisdom in Dreams” (Annual Conference of the International Association for the Study of Dreams, Asheville, NC, 2010).

<sup>46</sup> Nelson, *Dreaming in Church*, 94. Nelson identifies Johnson as a member of the International Association for the Study of Dreams.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

is to take one beyond.”<sup>48</sup> Rowland emphatically argues that “[dreams] must not be automatically referred to Oedipal stories of the subject [as Freud would do]: they are messages from a superior ‘other.’”<sup>49</sup> In fact, she insists that interpreting dreams from the perspective of one’s ego consciousness is to “damage their authenticity as the spontaneous products of archetypes. In a very real sense, to do so would be to betray the dreamer because her true ‘self’ lies in the unconscious, never in the ego.”<sup>50</sup> Halligan quotes Jung’s argument for staying close to the “manifest content” of the dream:

Interpretation must guard against making use of any other viewpoints than those manifestly given by the content itself. If someone dreams of a lion, the correct interpretation can lie only in the direction of the lion; in other words, it will be essentially an amplification of this image. Anything else would be an inadequate and incorrect interpretation, since the image ‘lion’ is a quite unmistakable and sufficiently positive presentation.<sup>51</sup>

Hillman similarly urges against moving too quickly from the “affective” visual level to the “level of interpretative discourse.”<sup>52</sup> He saw dream images as less like signs and more like “living animals” with “presence, place, and body” that “show us our fate and await a response from us.”<sup>53</sup> Nelson summarizes the respect dreams deserve when he claims they “will not always speak nicely, but they will speak honestly.”<sup>54</sup>

### **Methods of Interpretation**

Methods abound for decoding one’s own dreams, but most writers’ steps commonly include: (1) approaching dreams seriously and with conscious intent—one must be willing to

---

<sup>48</sup> Fredrica R. Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” in *Handbook of Religious Experience*, ed. Ralph W. Hood (Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1995), 246.

<sup>49</sup> Susan Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision* (Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2002), 37.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 247.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 246; Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*.

<sup>53</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 19.

<sup>54</sup> Nelson, *Dreaming in Church*, 82.

“find something new”<sup>55</sup>; (2) writing them down quickly upon awakening (Kelsey states that 95% of dreams that go unwritten or unshared are forgotten within five minutes)<sup>56</sup> and often phrased in present tense; (3) recording the major images (characters, settings, colors, emotions, activities, etc.) within the dream; (4) listing one’s associations with each image; (5) exploring the transpersonal nature of some images and noting archetypal content; and, (6) paying attention to what rings true or “clicks” regarding a possible meaning. More specifically, Jungian-influenced writers incorporate such techniques as *association*, *amplification*, and *active imagination* or *animation*, with each tapping a deeper level of the psyche.

### *Association*

Freud used *association* to uncover connections between the image and repressed psychic contents. Jungians use this step to elicit the *affective* link between an image and the dreamer.<sup>57</sup> For example, if the color “blue” appears in a dream, the dreamer might note such associations as “sky,” “sea,” or “Grandma’s kitchen table.” Another important consideration at this level of exploration is whether the dream image relates primarily to the *objective* level of meaning or the *subjective* level. Jungian writers generally understand human characters in a dream as representing intrapsychic, *subjective* aspects of the dreamer, rather than *objective* concerns, even if a dream figure is someone familiar. When we dream of other people, “99 percent of the time we are not dreaming of them,” argues Kelsey,

but of a part of ourselves like them. We may on occasion dream of others in an objective way, where they stand for themselves as well as representing to us parts of our own personalities, but it is often difficult to decide when the dream shows

---

<sup>55</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 31.

<sup>56</sup> Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*, 45–51.

<sup>57</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 246.

projection upon another person and when it does not and when it is a combination of these two positions.<sup>58</sup>

Though there are exceptions, Sanford agrees that “we can say as a general rule that every dream is about the dreamer, the dreamer’s problems, and the dreamer’s relationship to self and world.”<sup>59</sup> Rather than relating objective content about others, Johnson claims that dreams are most often about “the invisible energies that are shaping your inner path, the areas of your life where you need to become conscious or make changes.”<sup>60</sup> For Kelsey, it is imperative to remember that dream symbols “*can NEVER be studied from a book to give an easy, shorthand method of understanding dreams* [emphasis in original]. Like any living language, they must be read in context.”<sup>61</sup>

### *Amplification*

After the dreamer (often with the help of an analyst) has explored his or her personal context and affective associations to dream images, the next step is often what Jung called *amplification*. In this step, one draws from “myths, fairy tales, and ancient religious traditions”<sup>62</sup> for the purposes of discovering possible connections to transpersonal cultural “themes” that can be “either contemporary or historical.”<sup>63</sup> For Kalsched, amplification is like “gathering the free associations of the entire cultural canon to a particular image—mythology, religious iconography, folk lore, literature, etc.”<sup>64</sup> Unlike in association where one might understand a lion to symbolize infantile rage, through amplification “the lion now points to something regal, noble,

---

<sup>58</sup> Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*, 41.

<sup>59</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language*, 103.

<sup>60</sup> Johnson, *Inner Work*, 95.

<sup>61</sup> Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation*, 180.

<sup>62</sup> Johnson, *Inner Work*, 60.

<sup>63</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 17.

<sup>64</sup> Donald Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul: A Psycho-Spiritual Approach to Human Development and Its Interruption* (London, New York: Routledge, 2013), 65.

fierce, or big-hearted in our nature”; Aizenstat notes that in amplification, we “expand the image to its full stature as an archetype, and then see how that archetypal motif is currently active in our lives.”<sup>65</sup> Bulkeley agrees that this process of eliciting the “deeper elements of the dream’s meanings” can bring “new perspectives” on particular images,<sup>66</sup> and open our awareness “to the great teachings that are alive and active in dream images.” Such teachings may

tell us about the perils of our situation, the potential positive outcomes, strategic teachings, and the collective wisdom of generations past...Every night the dreaming psyche is generating something of our own personal mythology, informing us about our origins, values, and so on. A single dream image, amplified through literature and mythology, can offer us tremendous insight into our lives.<sup>67</sup>

### *Active Imagination and Animation*

In *active imagination*, the dreamer intentionally bridges conscious and unconscious through imaginatively re-entering the dream story and “dreaming the dream onward” to enable it to continue its unfoldment.<sup>68</sup> Aizenstat’s method of Dream Tending uses *animation* in a way that follows Hillman’s view of the images as a “presence” and invites the dreamer to “bring the image to life in the present, see it clearly as a living entity, noticing all its features, how it interacts with you, how it affects you, etc.” When we have assumed this posture toward the image, we can then ask two critical questions: “Who is visiting now?” and “What is happening here?”<sup>69</sup> With these questions, the dreamer moves from a position of intellectual inquiry to an affective experience of the image in its “living, embodied reality.” The lion,

rather than just referring to our childhood rage or the universal archetype of nobility now takes on a physical existence, actually present in the room, on the prowl, roaring with its fanged mouth, lashing its tail and licking its huge, furry paws. Furthermore, this is not like watching a lion in a movie, because in

---

<sup>65</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 17.

<sup>66</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 31–32.

<sup>67</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 17.

<sup>68</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 32.

<sup>69</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 23, 33.

Hillman's animation we are able to actually interact with the lion, talk to it, ask it questions, pet its fur, hear what it has to say, and follow it through its habitat. It's a full-immersion, interactive experience.<sup>70</sup>

Hoss has developed his own six-question, Gestalt-based process called *image activation* to animate a dream image wherein one "becomes" the image that holds the most energy, emotion, or numinosity for the dreamer and then asks these questions of "oneself" as the image:

- 1) Who or what are you? (name and describe yourself as the dream image)
- 2) What is your purpose or function?
- 3) What do you like about what you are?
- 4) What do you dislike about what you are?
- 5) What do you fear most?
- 6) What do you desire most?<sup>71</sup>

After answering these six questions, the dreamer then relates the image and answers to waking life to see what new perspectives are reached. Johnson adds his own unique type of animation when he suggests inventing "ingenious rituals that will give your dream immediacy and physical concreteness...this step requires a *physical act* that will affirm the message of the dream."<sup>72</sup>

Using Johnson's method, if one were to dream of a turtle, one might then acquire a turtle figurine to bring the dream and its meaning into daily life.

At the end of the day, dream interpretation really all boils down to whether the dreamer has gained something from looking at her dream. Jung believed the only "legitimate criterion for a valid interpretation is its therapeutic value" and wrote that

It ought not matter to me whether the result of my musing on the dream is scientifically verifiable or tenable, otherwise I am pursuing an ulterior—and

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>71</sup> Robert J. Hoss, "Image Activation Dreamwork," accessed December 17, 2016, [http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/image\\_activation\\_dreamwork.htm](http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/image_activation_dreamwork.htm).

<sup>72</sup> Johnson, *Inner Work*, 97.



therefore autoerotic—aim. I must content myself wholly with the fact that the result means something to the patient and sets [his or her] life in motion again. I may allow myself only one criterion for the result of my labors. *Does it work?*<sup>73</sup> [emphasis mine]

I have shown in this section that it is possible to connect dreams with psychological compensation, the transcendent function and transformation. I have shown that dreams can be seen as *natural* yet *purposive* and carriers of transpersonal meaning and value, and that there are specific methods and tools that can be used to understand them. If the interpretation of dream images allows an individual to glean meaning from his or her dreams in such a way that fosters positive change, connects one to transpersonal reality, and enhances one's ability to contribute value to the greater whole, then it clearly is a practice that brings value, belonging, and transformation. What next can we learn from what cognitive researchers say about dreams and the dreaming brain?

## A SCIENTIFIC VIEW OF DREAMS

The last two decades have witnessed a surge of interest in scientific study of the dreaming brain. Now that we have explored a psychological view of dreaming, we must gain an understanding of what that recent research in cognitive/neuroscience reveals about the dreaming brain. In this section, I will show that we can link dreaming to body, to world, and to transformation because of what recent research has revealed about the brain and the entire body during REM and non-REM sleep, the brain regions active during dreaming, the spectrum of consciousness and the connection of the dreaming end of that spectrum to perception, and the relationships between dreaming, emotion, learning, change, and neuroplasticity.

---

<sup>73</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 33.

Over the years, researchers have determined that dreams typically last between 15-90 minutes, that humans seem to dream “five to seven times” per night, and that awakening someone during a dream may result in their temporary immobility “as one is paralyzed during this stage, so one does not act out the dream.”<sup>74</sup> It also appears that an absence of dreaming activity can negatively affect mental health.<sup>75</sup> Yet researchers in the psychological sciences have “bitterly” disagreed about significant aspects of dream research, including whether dreams are merely the result of higher-level mental functions imposing order upon lower-level chaotic input or, as Jung and Hillman have insisted, the “spontaneous expressions of a powerful symbolic intelligence which is different from but not inferior to waking rational thought.”<sup>76</sup>

Another point of dissention has been whether dreams experienced outside a controlled laboratory environment are valid; Foulkes says no, but Hunt believes laboratory-experienced dreams to be “generally fairly boring.” Meanwhile, Bulkeley notes a “sleep lab effect” which has a tendency to “homogenize” people’s dreams, and notes that “studies relying on laboratory data alone may not give a truly accurate and comprehensive picture of the human dreaming experience.”<sup>77</sup> Hunt sees such a polarized approach as unnecessary, preferring to use a more “comprehensive model of dream formation and function” that classifies dreams into six types: 1) *personal-mnemonic*, related to one’s personal, ordinary life; 2) *medical-somatic*, related to one’s physiological processes; 3) *prophetic*, related to the future; 4) *archetypal-spiritual*, related to powerful, transcendent forces; 5) *nightmares*; and, 6) *lucid dreams*, where the dreamer is aware he or she is dreaming.<sup>78</sup> Theories abound. Part of the difficulty in sorting through various

---

<sup>74</sup> Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*, 32–33.

<sup>75</sup> Ibid.

<sup>76</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 77.

<sup>77</sup> Ibid., 64, 76.

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 76.

theories of dreaming is that there is yet no universally accepted theory of mind—no agreed upon understanding of how our minds and physical brains are related.

This project does not answer that question but considers Whiteheadian “panexperientialism,” Hartshornian “pansomatism,” and Philip Clayton’s arguments for “strong emergence”<sup>79</sup> of mind to all be equally compelling and exciting. While unhesitatingly rejecting both physicalism and dualism, my preference regarding mind, brain, and body is to widen the lens to the view of psyche, which is both mind and body and conscious and unconscious awareness, neither of which can be limited to only the brain. With Whitehead, Jung, and Clayton, this work (as mentioned in Chapter 2) does not hold biology to be solely determinative of the individual or culture but, rather, argues that human intentionality and self-awareness emerge from an *a priori* structure. In a one-world, integrated cosmos, we must accept that humans— and every aspect of human behavior—emerges from a natural world in which creatures co-create themselves.

Human subjective experience is of vital importance: as Clayton argues, “subjective experiences *matter*, and matter to us as *persons*.”<sup>80</sup> We know that there are “neural correlates of consciousness”<sup>81</sup> that show that the brain is somehow associated with our thought and conscious awareness. The implications of such findings though are not easy to pin down. As Clayton argues,

Research into the neural correlates of consciousness—one of the most fruitful research areas in the study of consciousness today—can offer no more than its name promises. At most one will be able to establish a series of *correlations* between brain states and phenomenal experiences as reported by subjects. Such correlations are of immense empirical significance. But if the resulting explanations are given exclusively in neurological terms, they will by the nature of the case not be able to specify what are the phenomenal experiences or *qualia*

---

<sup>79</sup> As is so well articulated in *Mind & Emergence: From Quantum to Consciousness*, Oxford University Press, 2004.

<sup>80</sup> Philip Clayton, *Mind and Emergence: From Quantum to Consciousness* (Oxford University Press, 2006), 108.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 112.

that the subjects experience. Nor will the causal effects of conscious experiences, if they indeed exist, be recognizable by these means.<sup>82</sup>

At the same time, it has become widely accepted that the gut and vagus nerve are somehow involved in the transmission of “gut instincts” to the brain.<sup>83</sup> This suggests that we cannot limit human “awareness” to either the brain or even to conscious thought. Human awareness is both fully embodied and spans the consciousness-to-unconsciousness spectrum. Moreover, as will be discussed later, we know that activities both real and imagined can be identically reflected in the the brain, suggesting that it is impossible to determine strictly by brain activity what is happening in the body or whether or not there are external, objective stimuli at play. For example, partnered sexual activity and solo sexual fantasy are reflected identically in the brain. As well, by looking at brain activity we cannot distinguish between an actual tennis match and an imagined tennis match. In other words, we cannot point with any certainty to the cause or original stimulus of experience based on brain activity. It seems questionable, then, to make causal assumptions regarding the relationship between physical brain and mind, or even between mind and body. Therefore, while Benjamin Libet may conclude that “conscious experiences reliably lag behind the brain events that presumably evoke them,”<sup>84</sup> I am unwilling to leap to the conclusion that the same is true of *unconscious* experiences and overall *somatic awareness*. In fact, by using the term *somatic awareness*, I am telegraphing that I question limiting awareness to the brain-mind system at all.

As was noted earlier in this chapter, “brainstem reductionists” have yet to be able to explain how the physical aspects of brain activity during sleep “add up to the multisensory

---

<sup>82</sup> Ibid., 120.

<sup>83</sup> Christopher Bergland, “How Does the Vagus Nerve Convey Gut Instincts to the Brain?,” *Psychology Today*, May 23, 2014, passim, <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-athletes-way/201405/how-does-the-vagus-nerve-convey-gut-instincts-the-brain>.

<sup>84</sup> Clayton, *Mind and Emergence*, 115.

experience of a dream.”<sup>85</sup> The reason to include brain research in this project is not to establish a particular theory of mind but to establish clearly that dreaming involves mind, brain, *and* body, and must be understood in this integrated way. Such research is also compelling because it grounds Jung’s theories of dreaming and the psyche in embodied functions. Yet it is crucial to keep in mind that neither the mental nor physical aspects of dreaming provide definitive answers as to the source of human consciousness. Recognizing these limitations to what can be discovered in this arena, let us now turn to a limited survey of how researchers in the cognitive sciences understand what is going on in our sleeping—and dreaming—brains.

### **The Dreaming Brain**

The most recent sleep laboratory research has determined that there are four stages of non-rapid eye movement (NREM) sleep, and sleepers “descend” through those four stages until the first period of REM sleep is typically experienced approximately 90 minutes after sleep onset. The pattern of “regular alteration” of REM and NREM sleep stages occurs throughout the night. During REM sleep,

Brain wave activity increases dramatically, muscle tone changes, heartbeat and respiration become irregular, and blood flow to the genitals increases (resulting in enlargement of the clitoris in women and erection of the penis in men)...Research by Dement and by Michel Jouvet, a French neurosurgeon, demonstrated that a very similar cycle of REM-NREM sleep alteration occurs in cats. Other sleep laboratory researchers soon confirmed that all mammals (with the apparent exceptions of the spiny anteater and the bottlenose dolphin...experience substantial amounts of REM sleep.<sup>86</sup>

According to Hartmann (d. 2013), who was a professor of psychiatry at Tufts University School of Medicine and a leading researcher on dreaming, the cycle of REM-NREM sleep is basic to all

---

<sup>85</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 100.

<sup>86</sup> *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 53–55.

mammals in a way that is “similar to the pulse cycle or the respiratory cycle.” He describes REM sleep as an “organismic state—a state of the entire body—during which everything in the brain and body is controlled and regulated in a way that is different from the regulation that occurs in waking or in NREM” sleep.<sup>87</sup> Surprisingly, research has shown that REM sleep and dreaming are not *isomorphic*; dreaming seems to depend “not on REM sleep per se but rather on the brain reaching a certain threshold of activation in several different neural systems.”<sup>88</sup> Hartmann indicates that individuals who have incurred damage to “certain cortical areas” of their brains may stop dreaming completely while still experiencing REM sleep patterns, leading researchers to conclude that the cortical activity pattern is what underlies dreaming.<sup>89</sup> In the deepest stage of sleep, the brain’s energy use is lower but in REM sleep,

the brain shifts to a high energy, high activation mode...Parts of the brain devoted to short-term memory and focused attention are relatively quiet, and the paths to motor action are blocked, while neural systems involved in arousal, emotion, long-term memory, instinct, curiosity, orienting, and visual imagination are highly active.<sup>90</sup>

Citing Solms’ research, Bulkeley notes five different brain regions to be involved in dreaming, and these brain regions have also been shown to be active during particular human activities (shown in *Table 1*).<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 3–4.

<sup>88</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 96–97.

<sup>89</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 37.

<sup>90</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 42.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, 98.

| <b>Brain Region</b>                 | <b>Associated Activities</b>  |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Basal forebrain pathways            | Appetitive interests, seeking behaviors, curiosity, exploration, and expectation. |
| Medial occipito-temporal structures | Visual associations, symbolic representations, and complex imagery                |
| Inferior parietal region            | Spatial cognition   |
| Frontal-limbic region               | Mental selectivity, reality monitoring, and separation of dreaming from waking.   |
| Temporal-limbic structures          | Emotional arousal, instinctual behaviors, and seizure-like behavior.              |

*Table 1: Brain regions involved in dreaming.*

### **Dreams, Emotion, Metaphor, and Learning**

Though our experience may suggest otherwise, Hartmann shows that waking and sleep are not “polar opposites”; in fact, during sleep the brain is engaged “in a variety of complex, dynamically interacting cycles of activity that involve many of the same neural systems considered essential to waking consciousness.”<sup>92</sup> He describes a brain function continuum in which dreaming is at the “right” end and focused-waking-thought is on the “left” end; such states as reverie and daydreaming fall to the “left” of dreaming but there is “no sudden break or discontinuity” between them and dreaming.<sup>93</sup> At that “right” end of the continuum,

there is less serial processing, less task-orientation, less functioning by formal rules, less constraint. The system ‘relaxes’ into a default mode, functioning by similarity (metaphor), rather than formal rules, guided by whatever emotions or emotional concerns are present.<sup>94</sup>

Using the example of a dreamer whose central dream image was of a tidal wave, Hartmann illustrates the use of metaphor in dreams to “picture” emotions or emotional concerns. The tidal wave image is not determined by a long thought process that finally culminates in a

---

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., 28.

<sup>93</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 33.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., 5.

consciously-chosen image; rather, the image “actually comes closer to the underlying feeling” than any verbal description one may give of one’s emotions.<sup>95</sup> He describes human functioning in the default mode of the brain (sometimes referred to as the default mode network or DMN) as one in which our sensorial bodies perceive our surroundings and create a “sensorium”—“a picture of the surrounding world”—yet, when we are in focused-waking-thought, our calculating, problem-solving, navigating functioning constrains default perception and we are less aware of our “sensorium, picture-making machine at work.”<sup>96</sup>

It is that very “picture-making machine” that is most operative when children learn. Children do not learn by “rules,” but through “metaphoric similarities” that connect “seemingly unrelated subjects.” Hartmann explains that

A child first learning the concept of ‘bird,’ for instance, does not learn rules about wings, behavioral habits, egg laying, warm-bloodedness. Rather, the child develops an image or an archetype of a bird something like a robin. Then when deciding whether a new creature is a bird she compares it to this image of the robin in her mind to make a decision...Our brain functioning seems to work first or most easily by similarity or metaphor.<sup>97</sup>

Humans use metaphor to “note and picture similarity” and Hartmann argues that this is especially true when we are dealing with our emotionally-driven and wordless “primary experiences.”<sup>98</sup> He links this capacity for metaphor, emotion, and images to dreaming and even memory by noting that

Metaphor is the way we think...[it] applies not only to speech and thought but to all mental processing which includes emotion and the pictures of emotion...Our whole sense of self is built of emotion-guided memories, and I believe that dreaming plays a part in producing and structuring our memory systems.<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 66.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 58.

<sup>98</sup> Ibid., 52.

<sup>99</sup> Ibid., 53, 59.



Moreover, emotions seem to play a strong influential role in our dream imagery, “forming” or “shaping” the imagery in the same way that they influence the poet’s pen or the painter’s brush.<sup>100</sup>

The emotional influence on dream imagery seems to be especially strong after any kind of trauma where dreams often strikingly reflect the dreamer’s emotional state and feature what Hartmann calls a “Central Image” that “pictures the powerful underlying emotions.” In fact, his research suggests that more powerful and intense emotions result in more intense Central Images. In one study, “blind” scorers read dream reports, noting particularly vivid and powerful images, and then identified any emotions from a list of 18 that might be represented in those images. As expected, the Central Image Intensity (CII) was higher in dreams than in daydreams, and higher in REM awakenings versus non-REM awakenings.

We then went on to look at whether CII is related to emotion and the power of the dreamer’s emotion. In one study we found that CII is rated higher in ‘dreams that stand out’ than in ‘recent dreams’ from the same persons. Likewise, CII is scored higher in dreams characterized as ‘the earliest dream you can remember’ than in ‘recent dreams.’...We found that CII is especially high in dreams considered ‘big’ dreams, no matter how these are defined.<sup>101</sup>

In another study, Hartmann found an increase in dreams with a higher Central Image Intensity following the 9/11 attacks in the United States; the images recorded were rated as mostly picturing fear/terror and helplessness/vulnerability. The correlation between higher CII and traumatic experience was also suggested in research involving the dreams of college students who reported having experienced physical or sexual abuse in early life. The dreams of those who experienced such abuse had a significantly higher CII score than those who had not experienced

---

<sup>100</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 4–15.

such abuse.<sup>102</sup> What purpose could such powerful, emotionally-influenced imagery in dreams be serving?

Decades of research that has examined the relationship between “sleep, memory, and learning” seems to suggest that at least one of the purposes dreaming serves is the learning and integration of new material. Bulkeley notes that mammals experience REM sleep, whereas reptiles and birds do not, suggesting an evolutionary adaptive value. In addition, studies “have shown that sleep helps the mind process information from waking experiences, consolidate memories, and learn new skills.” Research also suggests that dreaming may positively affect “early growth and adaptation of the brain; may help people respond effectively to novel, complex, and/or anxiety-provoking experiences; and may generally work to process new information learned during the day.”<sup>103</sup> Hartmann’s research leads him to conclude that rather than serving to “consolidate” memory through a “replay” of events of the day, dreaming “weaves in” and “integrates new material into existing memory, guided by emotion,” changing the material as needed to weave it “into an ongoing story.”<sup>104</sup> In his *Contemporary Theory of Dreaming*, Hartmann concludes that:

1. Dreaming is a form of mental functioning, inseparable from other mental functioning, and not any kind of “alien intrusion” or “foreign language.”
2. Dreaming is “hyper-connective”; it involves new connections, and “is creation, not replay.”
3. The connections made in dreams are not random, but guided by the emotions of the dreamer.

---

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 15, 17.

<sup>103</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 65.

<sup>104</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 23–24.

4. The “picture-metaphor” language of dreams is not unique to dreaming, but is consistent with the more “relaxed” form of processing in the “default mode” of brain functioning.
5. Dreaming is an “adaptive” function where new material is “woven in” to existing memory systems to “help us build and rebuild a meaningful emotional memory system, which is the basis of our individual selves.” Remembering dreams is not necessary for this to occur, but may increase “self-knowledge” and produce “new insights and creations.”
6. “The entire waking-to-dreaming continuum has an adaptive function” that allows humans to both think in “direct, focused, serial fashion” yet to also “associate more broadly and loosely” as appropriate.<sup>105</sup>

Even more, Bulkeley notes that “dreams promote psychological integration, preserve our emotional balance, and help us overcome crises, conflicts, and traumas.”<sup>106</sup> Similar conclusions have been drawn by Hoss, who has conducted various meta-analyses of the work of leading cognitive scientists investigating dreams<sup>107</sup> and argues that their work supports the existence of an “emotionally guided, self-restoration, creative problem solving and behavioral learning function”<sup>108</sup> in dreaming. He notes that

High activity in the amygdala and associated limbic system has led many researchers to conclude that dreams ‘selectively process emotionally relevant memories’ via [an] interplay between the cortex and the limbic system... and that the amygdala actually ‘orchestrates’ the dream activity...integrating dream emotion with actions, and helping to form dream image-to-emotional memory associations...Dream imagery arising in the form [of] emotionally charged ‘picture-metaphor’ is in part due to the active visual association cortex, which

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 5–6.

<sup>106</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 7–8.

<sup>107</sup> Hoss’ work cites such researchers as Hartmann, Hobson, Maquet, Peters, Braun, Balkin, Nofzinger, Mintun, Pace-Schott.

<sup>108</sup> Hoss, “Evidence of a Cognitive Function within Dreams,” 2.

forms picture associations with the information it receives. The interplay with the limbic system and the amygdala (which is known to associate emotion with imagery) as well as the active right inferior parietal cortex (involved in our perception of a visual space) plus the active right temporal lobe (figurative language and metaphor processing) supports the creation of these picture-metaphors as representing meaningful emotionally-driven internal connection.<sup>109</sup>

Alane Daugherty, professor of kinesiology and health promotion, describes the amygdala, the hippocampus and the anterior cingulate as associated with “meaning making and emotional perception,” and linked with “emotional or implicit memory. They are the seats of perception and the structures that help us attach meaning to circumstances in our lives.”<sup>110</sup> On the other hand, Richard Kradin, a physician and researcher in psychosomatic medicine, disagrees that the brain physically “stores” memory at all. Instead, he prefers a model that differentiates between those memories that are registered in consciousness and “verbally accessible” by the hippocampus and those that are “encoded out of consciousness,” not retrievable by conscious will, and “state-dependent,” meaning that they require “sensory and affective cues comparable to those available during their encoding in order to be retrieved.”<sup>111</sup> We might infer Daugherty’s claims to be referring only to those memories “encoded out of consciousness.”

Hoss is interested in correlating cognitive scientists’ findings to Jung’s theories of dreaming and has noted significant parallels that seem to provide “neurological support” for Jung’s approach, especially regarding his stances on dreams as unconscious expression, dream symbols as “emotionally charged pictorial language” that is revealing the “unconscious meaning” of experiences, and on dreams as playing a role in both the psyche’s compensatory

---

<sup>109</sup> Ibid., 3.

<sup>110</sup> Alane Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness: A Journey of Transformation through the Science of Embodiment* (Bloomington, IN: Balboa Press, 2014), 54.

<sup>111</sup> Richard Kradin, “Reply to Bessel van Der Kolk,” in *Imagination and Medicine*, ed. Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009), 192.

function and its transcendent function.<sup>112</sup> Hoss notes that the use of positron emission tomography (PET) scans has revealed a “unique combination of active and inactive centers” that may provide the basis for the dream’s ability to reflect “the unconscious meaning of a conscious experience.”

During REM, executive functions are inactive including: rational thought and linear logic, episodic memory and sensory and motor functions. However, a unique combination of centers involving the ‘emotional brain,’ the visual ‘association’ cortex and much of the unconscious brain, become active which not only stimulates the dream and dream imagery, but suggests a high degree of unconscious internal processing and cognition. Inactivity in the dorsolateral pre-frontal cortex permits the bizarre, non-linear dreaming to proceed without filtering or reflection on rational models, and the changes to the precuneus (Fosse, 2003) all but eliminate the waking life episode which might have triggered the dream.<sup>113</sup>

Hoss’ findings are summarized in *Table 2*.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>112</sup> Robert J. Hoss, “Recent Neurological Studies Supportive of Jung’s Theories on Dreaming” (Annual Conference of the International Association for the Study of Dreams, Berkeley, CA, 2012).

<sup>113</sup> Hoss, “Evidence of a Cognitive Function within Dreams,” 2–3.

<sup>114</sup> Hoss, “Recent Neurological Studies Supportive of Jung’s Theories on Dreaming,” 1–7.

| Jung's Theory  | Neurological Finding   | Hoss's Conclusions   |
|--|--|--|
| Dreams are an "expression of the unconscious" and are "unconscious processes obtruding on consciousness."  | Brain centers related to executive functions, waking consciousness, working memory, and conscious reflection are "demodulated" while brain centers that function "below the threshold of conscious awareness or preceding conscious awareness" are highly active. (Hobson, et al. 2002, 2003)  | Dreams occur during brain states that are not identified with conscious processing   |
| Symbols are "emotionally charged picture language."  | <p>High levels of activity during REM sleep in the amygdala, limbic system, and medial and some caudal frontal regions which are involved in emotionally charged actions and decision making.</p> <p>Sensory input and primary visual center are inhibited, but "visual association cortex, temporal and certain pre-motor," and areas which form "sensory representations with information that originates totally from within" are "highly active." The right inferior parietal cortex is also active. (Hobson, et al., Hartmann, Seligman &amp; Yellen, Dang-Vu et al.)</p>   | <p>Dreams "selectively process emotionally relevant memories"; the amygdala "orchestrates" the dream plot; imagery contains the "feeling state" of the dreamer; and "activity in these regions may account for the instinctive elements in dreams"</p> <p>"Internally generated information (feelings, memories, concepts) are represented as associations and picture-metaphor; "sensory and motor elements appear as fictive movements and sensations." The right inferior parietal cortex (involved in spatial organization and creation of dream imagery) "creates representations which are integrated into dream space."</p> |
| Dreams play a role in the psyche's compensatory function "to restore psychological balance by producing dream material that re-establishes psychic equilibrium," and in the transcendent function to allow the individual to move from a deficient attitude to a new attitude. | <p>"Dreams operate much like the brain learns—weaving new material into established memory—making new connections, expressed in picture-metaphors that reveal new perspectives &amp; insights." (Hartmann, 2011)</p> <p>Five brain functions active during REM:</p> <p><b>1) Conflict detection</b> (<i>basal ganglion and anterior cingulate</i> play roles in error detection; <i>anterior cingulate</i> monitors conflict and anomalies; <i>caudal and lateral orbitofrontal cortex</i> "are involved in inspection of events that deviate from expectation")</p> <p><b>2) Resolution initiation and mediation</b> ("<i>anterior cingulate</i> mediates action aimed at choosing between conflicting perceptions"; <i>basal ganglia</i> "generates paradoxical behavior metaphors" and involved in "novelty-related decision making")</p> <p><b>3) Imagining and testing of self-focused goal directed scenarios</b> (<i>anterior cingulate</i> "imagines or observes an outcome and monitors the consequences"; the <i>medial pre-frontal cortex</i> is involved in "introspective self-referential behavioral [simulation] and rehearsal")</p> <p><b>4) Cues and "sense of knowing" influences the dream activity</b> (<i>anterior cingulate</i> detects conditions under</p> | <p>Evidence from PET studies allows researchers to hypothesize the role of certain brain centers on dream content based on the "role those centers play in the waking state" and "further research findings on those centers are suggestive that the dreaming brain has the potential capacity to operate in a manner supportive of Jung's observations"; that what Jung called the "transcendent function" is "organically possible."</p> <p>Reported dream content reflects the processes listed to the left and the adaptation and learning that results.</p>   |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
|  | <p>which errors are likely and cues other parts of the brain and “contains a representation of the self at each moment in time and acts as a comparator between these points in time...and is able to compare feelings of the past, present, and future”; <i>insula</i> “is involved in subjective feelings, perceptual decision making and sudden insight”; <i>basal ganglia</i> seeks “eventual rather than immediate reward”; <i>medial pre-frontal cortex</i> “self-monitors learning, provides a ‘sense of knowing’ and retrospective confidence judgment”; the <i>orbitofrontal cortex</i> “is involved in regulating planning behavior based on reward/punishment so as to change ongoing behavior.”)</p> <p><b>5) Emotional Reinforcement and Adaptive Learning</b> (<i>anterior cingulate</i> “observes and monitors performance and outcome to select an appropriate response based on anticipating &amp; valuing rewards” and is involved in “focused problem-solving and adaptive response to changing conditions”; <i>basal ganglia</i> involved in “reward-based adaptive action planning and learning”; sections of the <i>orbitofrontal cortex</i> are involved in “decision making, expectation and regulating our planning behavior so as to change our ongoing behavior.”)</p> <p>(Falkenstein, Bush, Allman, Botvinick, Posner, Carter, Flavio, Petrides, St. Clair, Yamada, Hayden, Apps, Luu et al., Partiot et al., Kringlebach, Vertes, Gusnard, Craig, Packard, Marley, Lieberman)</p> |  |
|--|---|--|

Table 2, Hoss’s Findings

In “Dream Observation #2,” Hoss describes a man who had been offered a teaching appointment in a field of study within which he had not been active for quite some time; the dreamer’s conscious attitude was that “there is no way I can resurrect my old talents, they are gone forever.” Hoss quotes the dreamer and notes the appearance of the five functions as listed in *Table 2* in his dream:

I was wandering through a desert and saw an old rusty car. I looked inside and found a man who was not moving. I was going to give him up for dead [*conflict detected*], but my unknown companion urged me to wake the man [*resolution initiated, compensating cues*]. I argued that it was useless [*mediation*] but after much discussion reluctantly gave in and shook the man [*scenario tested*]. When I did, both the man and the car came to life [*compensation*] and the car transformed into a newer car [*emotional reinforcement*].<sup>115</sup>

<sup>115</sup> Ibid., 6.

Describing another dream, Hoss writes of a corporate executive whose company was laying off top executives; while the executive hoped he would be spared, “he feared his career was ending.”

Yet a dream “changed him.”

I am a passenger in a boat on a dark underground river trying to find a way out and a ‘position’ in the windows where I can see daylight [*conflict detected*]. The tour guide appears behind me and points to an opening in front that I had not seen before [*compensation*] and says, ‘you can walk out that door’ [*imagined resolution and cues*]. I didn’t understand what he was telling me, but finally at his constant urging [*mediation*], I walked out the door [*scenario tested*]. When I did the boat emerged from an ice cave into a bright beautiful sunlit setting of calm water [*reinforced*].<sup>116</sup>

Shortly after dreaming the dream, the dreamer was offered an “exceptional” new position and happily left his company.

It appears that our dreaming body-mind seems to be able to “make new connections and reveal them in meaningful picture-metaphors.” *Even more important*, it seems that our dreaming body-mind has the capacity to resolve “emotionally important issues” by

recognizing anomalies, conflicting perceptions and threats to our inner sense of self; mediating a resolution by creating imagined outcomes in the form of dream scenarios; monitoring the outcome; selecting a scenario based on achieving the anticipated rewards; and encoding that result in memory as something learned.<sup>117</sup>

We must be somewhat cautious in our claims about what scientific research shows the dream may be doing regarding development and learning, because there is not yet a way to objectively prove even the occurrence of a dream let alone what centers of the brain are active during particular dream scenarios and the role they may play in the dreamer’s experience. Yet Hoss notes that while “such conclusions can only be deductive... the overall picture looks promising.”<sup>118</sup>

---

<sup>116</sup> Ibid.

<sup>117</sup> Hoss, “Evidence of a Cognitive Function within Dreams,” 4.

<sup>118</sup> Hoss, “Recent Neurological Studies Supportive of Jung’s Theories on Dreaming,” 7.



Although he claims that the area of research that connects dreaming to learning is “contentious,” Bulkeley notes that it might be better viewed through the lens of neuroplasticity, which describes the brain as having the ability to “change, adapt, and reorganize itself in response to experience.”<sup>119</sup> Research in neuroplasticity suggests that there is a correlation between the firing patterns of neurons and learning, meaning that the more we repeat a behavior, the more efficient the firing becomes between the neurons that are correlated with that behavior. Daugherty’s work applies this concept to emotion claiming that the human limbic system connects the body and brain in such a way that when we perceive the world around us, especially if in a strongly threatening way, the body floods our system with chemicals that trigger the amygdala to “record” that experience for future reference through “implicit memory patterns that are then used as ‘blueprints’ to interpret and make meaning of future circumstances.”<sup>120</sup> Daugherty suggests that the more our experiences trigger the same emotions—the more the emotional “imprint” that is created by the neurons and glia in neural nets gets reinforced—the more that pattern gets re-activated. It then becomes even stronger and more likely to become one’s automatic response.

Hartmann believes that those patterns of activation, “when favored over time, in somewhat similar form across individuals,” can take on a transpersonal quality and show up as “typical dreams” and as archetypes and myths.<sup>121</sup> In what sounds astonishingly like Jung’s theory of the psychological complex, that imprint or emotional reactivity pattern is then triggered whenever a situation that even remotely resembles the original experience is perceived. The stronger those imprinted patterns become, the more we are “hijacked” by an emotional reaction

---

<sup>119</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 49–50.

<sup>120</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 35–53.

<sup>121</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 71.

that may be only minimally relevant to the situation at hand. The bad news is that “threat, anxiety and reactivity perpetuate themselves... We literally become more biologically capable of experiencing more of the same, and begin to suffer increasingly negative effects...[and] see the world through the lens of reactivity.”<sup>122</sup> The good news is that we are inherently adaptive, and it seems that the structure of our brains can actually change with new experience. When we have a new experience,

we create new neural connections, new neural nets and associative memory, and break old patterns and connections because they are no longer firing together. Now we can see true potential for transformation and healing, as evidenced through neuroplasticity and the working of our brains, and it is staggering.<sup>123</sup>

The best news of all is not only that neurons and glia form connections with other neurons and “grow and change throughout our life depending on experience”<sup>124</sup> but that “our brains do not know the difference between what is real and what is vividly imagined”<sup>125</sup> or, we might suppose, what is dreamed. In fact, Stephen LeBarge, a leading researcher into lucid dreaming, has discovered that “lucid dreams can produce physical effects on the dreamer’s brain no less real than those produced by corresponding events happening in the external world.”<sup>126</sup> Daugherty also argues that while our neural networks can be “re-wired” with new experience, “it is not the conscious mind that does the rewiring, it is deeply felt *experience*, internal or external and *experience is an embodied phenomenon*.”<sup>127</sup> Therefore, it seems possible that dreaming involves the interweaving of new embodied experience below the level of consciousness, guided by the “felt sense” and emotion that is associated with that experience, into existing memory

---

<sup>122</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 42.

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*, 47.

<sup>124</sup> *Ibid.*, 45.

<sup>125</sup> *Ibid.*, 76.

<sup>126</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 44.

<sup>127</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 76.

systems—or implicit memory imprints—and that such interweaving can be related to new connections and new learning.

### **Dreams, Imagination, and Healing**

Not only has recent research supported the positive relationship between dreaming and emotional processing as well as learning and change, studies also suggest a relationship between dreaming, imagination, and physical health and healing. Making physicalism moot, recent research into meditation, biofeedback, and prayer show that the mind can influence the body. If we consider our cultural roots, it seems that Western medicine has forgotten its own history regarding the importance of dreams to physical health. In the ancient Greek healing temples of the god Asklepios, the tradition “pivots around the divine power of imagination that can transform a body out of illness into health.”<sup>128</sup> Robert Bosnak, editor and contributor to *Imagination and Medicine* writes,

Western medicine from its inception was aware of the great power of dreaming, not for emotional purposes as used now in some circles ever since the beginning of psychoanalysis but for the treatment of physical illness. For close to a millennium, the people who gave us the foundation of most of Western thought, including science itself as well as its practical applications during the Roman Empire, swore by this method of dream healing.<sup>129</sup>

We are now beginning to remember that dreams can affect belief and belief can affect the body. This is no surprise to Marion Woodman, who stresses that psychological factors are “extremely important in healing because psyche and soma are virtually one.”<sup>130</sup> As well, Dr. Esther M. Sternberg argues that there is a psychological component to every cure, estimating that “about

---

<sup>128</sup> Robert Bosnak, “The Physician Inside,” in *Imagination and Medicine*, ed. Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009), xv.

<sup>129</sup> *Ibid.*, xviii.

<sup>130</sup> Marion Woodman, “Coming to a Door,” in *Imagination and Medicine*, ed. Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009), xi.

one-third of the therapeutic effect of every pill comes from the placebo effect,” where because we believe a medication will make us better, it does.<sup>131</sup> Moreover, our “learned associations” can actually “change the body’s nerve and hormone responses, which ultimately affect how immune cells work. In that sense, believing can make you sick or make you well.”<sup>132</sup> As Bulkeley suggests, certain rituals and practices based in dreams seem to “stimulate a natural placebo effect that aids the body’s innate capacities for healing, recovery, and self-repair.” This may be related to the fact that, during sleep, the body’s immune system is “highly active” and involved in health-related “endogenous healing processes” that may be enhanced by such rituals or dream practices.<sup>133</sup>

Recent studies have begun to examine how what used to be dismissed as merely the “placebo effect” might actually be a positive response to enlisting the patient’s imaginal resources. New research in this area has been explored at a series of “Imagination and Medicine” events held at Pacifica Graduate Institute and resulted in the publication of the book by the same name. As Bulkeley notes in his own work, such imaginal resources “can be activated in certain kinds of dreams, particularly in big dreams with highly memorable images, characters, and emotions. These dreams can boost the physiological impact of the placebo effect and mobilize the body’s own illness-fighting defenses.”<sup>134</sup> In addition, Ernest Lawrence Rossi and Kathryn Lane Rossi have proffered a fascinating theory of the relationship between the mind, brain, mirror neurons, and our DNA, arguing that “the mind updates the brain daily via the mirror

---

<sup>131</sup> Esther M. Sternberg, “Can Believing Make You Well? A Decade Later,” in *Imagination and Medicine*, ed. Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009), 96.

<sup>132</sup> *Ibid.*, 88.

<sup>133</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 243.

<sup>134</sup> *Ibid.*

neuron system encoding the novel and numinous experiences of consciousness and dreaming.”<sup>135</sup>

His theory suggests that

Novel and numinous experiences of observing consciousness can activate mirror neurons to turn on their gene expression/protein synthesis cycle and brain plasticity, which generate the possibility of new consciousness, mind-body healing, and rehabilitation...our dreams function as a ‘self-reflective apparatus’ that mirrors our internal world.<sup>136</sup>

We must, along with Bulkeley and James W. Jones, challenge “the philosophical premise of *physicalism*” especially in the medical field; for, as Jones argues, “The kind of self-regulation currently being demonstrated in psychophysiological laboratories and clinical practice, involving hypnosis, biofeedback, and meditation, demands a robust account of mental causation.”<sup>137</sup> In fact, the question of how mental states have any effect at all upon the world is, in Clayton’s opinion, the “more difficult” question when it comes to the “hard problem of consciousness.”<sup>138</sup>

In this section, through a limited survey of research on the brain, dreaming, emotion, learning, and physical healing, I have shown that (1) although there is some disagreement among researchers as to the nature and function of dreaming and its relationship to the brain, dreaming is an activity of both body and mind; (2) the various brain regions active during dreams are correlated with the same kinds of functions described in Jung’s psychology; (3) dreaming seems to involve emotion, trauma, learning, responsiveness, adaptation, integration, problem solving, and the body’s perception of its surrounding world; and, (4) that we can connect neuroplasticity, entrenched behavior patterns, and transformational experience through dreams because the dreaming brain cannot discern between actual experience and dreamed experience in terms of

---

<sup>135</sup> Ernest Lawrence Rossi and Kathryn Lane Rossi, “How the Mind and Brain Co-Crete Each Other Daily,” in *Imagination and Medicine*, ed. Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009), 135.

<sup>136</sup> Sternberg, “How the Mind and Brain Co-Crete Each Other,” 136, 138.

<sup>137</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 248–49.

<sup>138</sup> Clayton, *Mind and Emergence*, 123.

their potential effect. Because we can make these connections, we can link dreaming to body, to world, and to transformation.

## A COMMUNAL VIEW OF DREAMS

So far, we have learned that a psychological view of dreams connects them to personal life and meaning as well as to transpersonal vision and *value* through the role of archetypes and archetypal images. We have also gotten a glimpse through Jungian psychology how the embodied psyche is connected to nature, human history, and culture, and therefore how dreams connect to *belonging*. I have also shown how dreams when viewed psychologically are related to *transformation* and positive change. By touching on the science of the dreaming brain and neuroplasticity, I have shown how a scientific view connects dreams to the emotional body-mind, to the body's perception of its internal and external world of concerns, and how dream research supports a Jungian approach to dreams and dream work thereby also linking dreams to *belonging* and *transformation*. Now we will turn to the communal view of dreams witnessed in the rise of dream sharing groups and explore how such groups reflect dreaming and dream work as shared experience, shared meaning, and shared growth and learning, and, therefore, connected to *value*, *belonging*, and *transformation*.

Historically, dreams had regularly been explored in religious or communal contexts, but with the rise of psychology came the secularization of dreams, wherein psychologists have focused primarily on the “intrapsychic aspects of dreams.”<sup>139</sup> This began to change in the late 1960s and early 1970s, when what Bulkeley calls an “interesting new twist” developed—the rise of dream sharing groups—that was prompted primarily by the writings of Ann Faraday, Patricia

---

<sup>139</sup> Bulkeley, “Dream-Sharing Groups, Spirituality, and Community,” 59.

Garfield, Montague Ullman and Nan Zimmerman, Gayle Delaney, and Jeremy Taylor. “Each of these authors argued,” notes Bulkeley, “that the disciplined, self-reflective practice of exploring dreams should be expanded beyond the confines of professional psychotherapy and made more accessible to the general population.”<sup>140</sup> He estimates that in excess of fifty thousand dream groups were formed in the United States alone between the 1960s and the 1990s with participation approximating 500,000 individuals.<sup>141</sup> Credit for this phenomenon belongs primarily to the work of Montague Ullman, a psychiatrist who opened the first community mental health center in New York City as well as the Dream Laboratory at the Maimonides Medical Center,<sup>142</sup> and Jeremy Taylor, a Unitarian Universalist minister and author.<sup>143</sup>

The phenomenon of dream-sharing groups has garnered little scholarly attention to date, yet Bulkeley argues that scholars of religion and psychology should take an interest for three reasons: (1) Such groups of individuals often work with their dreams to gain spiritual insights; (2) the “interplay” of religion, psychology, and culture can shed some light on the secularization process in contemporary society; and (3) dream-sharing groups often experience a deepened sense of community and intimacy.<sup>144</sup> Dream groups have displayed great diversity in structure and processes; groups have been formed around particular interests, including Jungian psychology or personal needs (support groups, 12-Step groups). They may be religious in nature; as well, some groups will draw on guided imagery, picture-drawing, or even dream theater to gather insights. Yet they do seem to share a “common core.” Bulkeley offers this description of an “ideal type” of dream-sharing group:

---

<sup>140</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 31, 34.

<sup>141</sup> *Ibid.*, 33–34.

<sup>142</sup> Markku Siivola, “Montague Ullman, Biographical Note,” accessed December 17, 2016, [http://siivola.org/monte/biographical\\_note.htm](http://siivola.org/monte/biographical_note.htm).

<sup>143</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 90.

<sup>144</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 31.

- Six to twelve people gather in a quiet, comfortable place
- One serves as leader or facilitator
- Each person briefly describes a dream they had
- The group chooses one dream to discuss in detail, asking questions and offering comments and meanings
- The discussion of a dream can take from 15 minutes to two hours
- Over time, everyone in the group will get to share their own dreams and comment on those of others<sup>145</sup>

Despite their diversity, dream groups typically share the core assumptions that “dreams are relevant to our important waking life concerns, that dreams can be understood without specialized knowledge, and that dreams have the potential to reveal profoundly transformational truths and insights.”<sup>146</sup>

Taylor established his first dream-sharing group while running a “consciousness-raising seminar on racism” to fulfill his civilian service requirements as a conscientious objector to the Vietnam War. As part of the discussion, he asked members to share and discuss dreams that featured people of color, and was astonished to see

‘the energy for growth and transformation of personality and unconscious attitudes and fears that were released by this work. The dream work was effective in bringing deep-seated unconscious ambivalences to light, and the work was further effective in transforming them, because each of us was forced to ‘own’ both the negative and positive images of black people in our dreams as representations of aspects of our own personalities.’<sup>147</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Bulkeley, “Dream-Sharing Groups, Spirituality, and Community,” 60.

<sup>146</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 33.

<sup>147</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 91.



Taylor later took a practice initially created by Ullman and developed it into what he called “Group Projective Dream Work.” This method assumes the posture that any interpretation made of another’s dream is more a subjective function of the interpreter’s own symbol system and preconceptions than it is objectively reflective of the meaning for the dreamer. As Nelson describes the process, once the dream is shared, members ask clarifying questions, not so much to “get inside the dreamer’s life but to find parallel emotions and associations in their own lives so that they can make the dream their own.” Members will then typically preface their interpretative comments with the phrase “If it were my dream...” or in some other way to indicate the projective nature of their comments and “their own relating to the dream as if it had happened to them.”<sup>148</sup> In Ullman’s thought, even “wrong” interpretations are “useful” in that they can help the dreamer to “define what the image is not and thereby may help the dreamer get closer to defining what it is.”<sup>149</sup> Taylor believes that if he or she is paying attention, a dreamer will experience an “aha!” or a “tingle feeling” when something intuitively truthful is discovered,<sup>150</sup> even by another dreamer. As he describes the benefits of projective dream work,

‘Because dreams always merge many levels of meaning into a single metaphor of dream experience, it is almost always productive to share dreams with people you care about and ask them about their dreams. When the multiple intelligences and intuitions of several people are brought to bear on a dream or series of dreams, it is much more likely that the dreamer will be exposed to a fuller range of the dream’s possible meaning, and will have a chance to ‘tingle’ and resonate to a wider spectrum of the dream’s multiple levels and layers of significance. This kind of collective, group dream work is most beneficial to the life of the imagination and can nurture a community of creativity.’<sup>151</sup>

Although Sanford considers it “perilous to try to analyze any dream without knowing the dreamer, the dreamer’s circumstances at the time, and the dreamer’s associations about the

---

<sup>148</sup> Nelson, *Dreaming in Church*, 115–16.

<sup>149</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 90–91.

<sup>150</sup> *Ibid.*, 91–92.

<sup>151</sup> Nelson, *Dreaming in Church*, 115.

dream symbols,”<sup>152</sup> a key aspect of group projective dream work is that the work can stay at a level that protects members’ psychological safety because the dreamer’s personal, private history and emotional concerns do not have to be revealed; there is therefore no effort on the part of laypersons to venture into deep psychological analysis. Moreover, Nelson cautions group members to not impose potentially anxiety-raising interpretations that go beyond the bounds of the dreamer’s present awareness, insisting that “we follow rather than lead the dreamer”<sup>153</sup> to ensure everyone’s psychological safety.

Would Jung have approved of dream-sharing groups? Not likely, speculates Singer, reminding us of Jung’s distrust of “the collective” and any association with mass-mindedness. “But since his death,” she writes, “we have learned so much about the value of working with groups, and dream work in groups has been shown to be valuable in ways Jung could not have dreamed of.”<sup>154</sup> Clearly, Jung believed dream interpretation to be the most effective means of integrating the unconscious with consciousness. Yet he is somewhat at odds with himself when he recommends that patients should not “depend permanently on outside help” while recognizing the difficulty of analyzing one’s own dreams.<sup>155</sup> So where does that leave the many who do not have access to costly analytical resources? Tacey shares this concern, accusing Jungians of being “unimaginative about finding other methods to impart their work beyond the clinical model” leaving the “complex journey of individuation” open only to those who can pay for therapy, a reality against which his “social conscience rebels.”<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>152</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language*, 55.

<sup>153</sup> Nelson, *Dreaming in Church*, 116.

<sup>154</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 261.

<sup>155</sup> C. G. Jung, *The Portable Jung*, ed. Joseph Campbell (New York: Viking Press, 1971), 283.

<sup>156</sup> David Tacey, “The Challenge of Teaching Jung in the University,” in *Teaching Jung*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, AAR Teaching Religious Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 14–15.

This project takes the position that one of those “other methods” is dream-sharing groups, a phenomenon that offers many life-enhancing outcomes. Hartmann argues that dream images can function similarly to the way that art serves as an emotional-aesthetic bridge between the artist and the audience; the emotion of the artist guides the production of the work which then pictures that emotion and that then “produces the same or a similar emotion in the audience seeing or hearing the work.”<sup>157</sup> The same happens when a dream that features an emotional Central Image is shared: the one hearing the dream empathetically feels what the dreamer’s image pictures. Ulanov illustrates this phenomenon when she describes a group experience where a woman matter-of-factly reported a dream that featured a powerful horse. It was not until a group member described the image as seeming “like a real fairy tale carried right into life” that the dreamer “felt she was about to swoon, as she often did if a remark really hit home.”<sup>158</sup>

It is well documented that dream-sharing groups help people to gain new insights about their own dreams or waking life concerns. For example, Bulkeley describes Lewis’ study of high school students who, in sharing their dreams, discovered “new sources of energy, creativity, and hope”<sup>159</sup> as well as Ehlert’s work with groups in prisons; she finds that dream-sharing helps prisoners discover “links between particular crimes committed by an offender and certain events, experiences, and conflicts in the offender’s past.”<sup>160</sup> Bulkeley disputes those who criticize dream groups as fostering “navel-gazing” self-interest stressing that dream-sharing can provide insight into problems at the “intersection of personal and social forces.”<sup>161</sup> Dream groups can “prove effective in revitalizing and deepening people’s fundamental sense of community”<sup>162</sup> and help

---

<sup>157</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 28.

<sup>158</sup> Ann Belford Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent* (Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1996), 11.

<sup>159</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 34.

<sup>160</sup> Bulkeley, “Dream-Sharing Groups, Spirituality, and Community,” 64.

<sup>161</sup> Ibid.

<sup>162</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 37.

people to “recognize a shared humanity in the midst of social and cultural differences.”<sup>163</sup> Most importantly, this goes beyond just reinforcing existing, homogenous communities. Taylor, pointing to his racism seminar experience, argues that “sharing dreams with other people has political and social value in helping overcome the barriers of race, age, sex, and class.

By revealing one’s own deepest hopes and fears, by giving insights into the deepest hopes and fears of other people, and by demonstrating how projections both hinder and enhance creative human relations, dream-sharing groups promote both personal and communal transformation: ‘the deep sense of community which group dream work creates continues to sustain and nurture the individual creativity and courage, without which collective change is impossible.’<sup>164</sup>

What is the “collective change” we seek now? If, as has been argued since the beginning of this project, we seek a resolution to the alienation and disenchantment that dualism and secularism have wrought, might dream-sharing groups be a part of that? Bulkeley answers affirmatively, arguing that “dream sharing groups offer the means to a *reenchantment* of the world, to a renewal and revival of authentic spiritual experience in contemporary society.”<sup>165</sup> While there are certainly many ways to engage the unconscious (Tacey lists religious and spiritual practices, the arts, romance and relationship; “any form of human activity that is creative, intuitive, or open to the nonrational side of experience”<sup>166</sup>), dream-sharing groups offer a way that is easily accessible with many positive benefits. As I have shown above, those benefits include being able to connect dreams and dream work to our shared experience and shared meaning at the intersection of the personal and the social in a way that helps us to gain new insights into human problems and better appreciate our shared humanity. Therefore, we can connect a communal view of dreams and dreamwork to *value, belonging, and transformation*.

---

<sup>163</sup> Bulkeley, “Dream-Sharing Groups, Spirituality, and Community,” 65.

<sup>164</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 92.

<sup>165</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 34.

<sup>166</sup> Tacey, “The Challenge of Teaching Jung in the University,” 15.

## A MYSTICAL VIEW OF DREAMS

We have seen how a psychological view, a scientific view, and a communal view of dreaming connects us to value, belonging, and transformation. But what might a *mystical* view bring to this project? As noted earlier, our understanding of dreams first emerged as *religious* because there seemed to be transpersonal or extra-mundane powers involved. “Virtually every religious tradition throughout history” has sought revelation, spiritual guidance, and creative inspiration in the dream experience.<sup>167</sup> Even more, Bulkeley argues that it is not merely coincidental that dreams and religion have always been in close relationship. In fact, the cultural records of the world’s religious traditions indicate that dreaming is somehow related to “the way religious ideas and feelings get started in people’s minds” and the “experiential origins of religious symbols, behaviors, beliefs, and practices.”<sup>168</sup> “Dreaming,” he concludes, “is a primal wellspring of religious experience.”<sup>169</sup> But what is the *nature* of this experience and how might it connect to our baseline criteria of *value*, *belonging*, and *transformation*? I will show that at least some dreams can be viewed as mystical because they connect us to transpersonal reality, are purposive, and bring guidance and healing, thus fostering wholeness and flourishing.

### Dreams and Religious Experience

Of course, there are many who would dismiss any view of dreams as religious experience. Freud saw them as merely garbled messages intent on hiding repressed desires. Meanwhile, because our dominant dualistic and mechanistic worldview immediately dismisses anything that smacks of the supernatural, many see dreams as merely random neuronal firings or

---

<sup>167</sup> Bulkeley, *Visions of the Night*, 7.

<sup>168</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 3.

<sup>169</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

promptings of last night's pizza. Yet this is the inherent problem: label some dreams *religious* and immediately the broader public assumes supernaturalist superstitions that should have been shed at the Enlightenment. When we consider other viewpoints—drawing from Jungian resources and beyond—we immediately see that this is not the only way to understand what is “religious.”

A Jungian approach to this question affords us a postmodern, trans-religious ability to bridge the dream experience with human spirituality because of Jung's understanding of archetypal symbols and their accessibility in dreams. Halligan notes that Jung's analytical psychology “situates...dreams within the full range of human religious experience”;<sup>170</sup> it is through inner psychic life that one has access to guidance or direction from that which is greater than the conscious ego. Even a neurosis or other psychological illness can be “purposive” and open the door to discovery, because it is at “the culmination of the illness” that Jung believed destructive forces were “converted into healing forces.”<sup>171</sup> Similarly, Taylor teaches that “all dreams come in the service of health and wholeness”; they can help dreamers find “internal peace and spiritual comfort” and even aid in decision-making. Because a dream is often a “gripping, mysterious, numinous experience” that carries “spontaneous” helpful information, human beings have generally attributed them to divine origins.<sup>172</sup>

The question we ask now is: Can one understand the numinous encounter, transformation and healing that often come through dreams as truly an encounter with *God*? And if so, must that God be understood *supernaturally*? Jung recognized dreams as carrying a ‘numinous’ quality,

---

<sup>170</sup> Halligan, “Jungian Theory and Religious Experience,” 238.

<sup>171</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 242.

<sup>172</sup> Jeremy Taylor, “Ambiguities of Privilege,” in *Dreaming in Christianity and Islam: Culture, Conflict, and Creativity*, ed. Kelly Bulkeley, Kate Adams, and Patricia M. Davis (New Brunswick, NJ; London: Rutgers University Press, 2009), 237, 239.

and drew from Rudolf Otto's work in this area. Otto described a numinous experience as an encounter with a holy other that seems to exist outside of nature yet with whom one is "in communion." He differentiated two kinds of numinous experience, one he called *mysterium fascinans* and the other *mysterium tremendum*. In the *fascinans* experience, one is drawn toward what one perceives as an awesome reality, and typically what researchers into mystical experience (James, Hood, Stace, Pargament) describe as an experience of unity. In a *tremendum* experience, on the other hand, one is somewhat repelled from what one perceives to be "awful" and "terrible"; this experience of "presence" typically serves to accentuate one's feeling of creatureliness vs. of one's power.<sup>173</sup> Rather than defining this "holy other" as supernatural, Jung believed it to be the unconscious that one encountered both within oneself and as an objective *other*.<sup>174</sup>

Jung's personal experience with this "other" in the unconscious led him to confidently claim that he *knew* that God exists,<sup>175</sup> yet he was "more modest" as to whether or not dream guidance came from God. Instead, he claimed that it is in such encounters that the archetypes "come to independent life and serve as spiritual guides for the personality, thus supplanting the inadequate ego with its futile willing and striving"; in such times the individual's "psyche has awakened to spontaneous life." Such experiences carry numinous power because the transformation that occurs cannot be linked to consciousness and so is experienced as a

revelation when, from the hidden depths of the psyche, something arises to confront [the individual]—something strange that is not the 'I' and therefore of personal caprice. [That person] has gained access to the sources of psychic life, and this marks the beginning of the cure.<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> Ralph W. Hood, "Mystical, Spiritual, and Religious Experiences," in *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, ed. Raymond F. Paloutzian and Crystal L. Park (New York: The Guilford Press, 2005), 356–57.

<sup>174</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 4.

<sup>175</sup> Walter Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos in the Thought of Carl Jung: The Theory of the Collective Unconscious in Scientific Perspective* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988), 76–77.

<sup>176</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 242.

In other words, experiencing the “sources of psychic life”—the heart of the universe, the flow of life beneath all manifestation—is psychologically equivalent to experiencing God. True to his location, Nelson argues in Christian terms that although “dreams are not God,” they “usher us into the realm of spirit where God’s Holy Spirit reigns supreme.”<sup>177</sup> Ann and Barry Ulanov, on the other hand, refuse to lock the God that we encounter in our dreams into any one religious tradition or image, insisting instead that the divine in our dreams is “God in hiding,” a “cloud of unknowing,” a “great shadow of the Holy,” and an “illuminating darkness” that draws near to us yet lies “outside our God-images.”

It is not so much that our images of God are wrong or our religious practices mistaken. They are simply too small in their finiteness. The dark side of God is a merciful one, effacing useless images, stretching, pushing us beyond even the best of what we have found in our traditions and created in our prayers.<sup>178</sup>

### **Dreams and Christian Experience**

These discussions form a compelling case that a dialogue with the unconscious through one’s dreams has value for individuals seeking wholeness. But of what value is dream work specifically for the Christian and what stands in the way of our embracing such a practice in the Church? Jung points to post-Enlightenment scientism as responsible for a modern mindset that cannot incorporate dreams and other symbolic information. Since “causality” has become one of “our most sacred dogmas” and “there is no legitimate place in our world for invisible, arbitrary and so-called supernatural forces,” we fail to give that which we perceive as being “contrary to reason” their due.<sup>179</sup>

---

<sup>177</sup> Nelson, *Dreaming in Church*, 23.

<sup>178</sup> Ann Belford Ulanov and Barry Ulanov, *Religion and the Unconscious* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985), 237–38.

<sup>179</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 130.



There seems to have been strong interest on the part of a significant number of Episcopal priests in becoming Jungian analysts, a pathway embodied by Morton Kelsey, John Sanford, Pittman McGehee, and Bob Haden, among others. Those Jungians writing from a Christian perspective have no doubt about the value of the dream to one's spiritual life. Kelsey considers dreams "a consistent body of impressive and powerful materials" that show "evidence of contact with the numinous." Exploring the realm of dreams leads us to experience "many layers and levels apart from the physical world... Once we know this reality, it makes very little difference what name we give it. Call it the 'unconscious,' the 'spiritual world,' the 'objective psyche,' 'psychoid reality,' 'heaven and hell,' the 'collective unconscious,' the 'realm of gods and demons,' or even '*alam al-mithal*'—these are all merely names to describe what we human beings find as we listen to the reality that comes through the depth of ourselves."<sup>180</sup> Sanford does not hesitate to identify this "purposeful, numinous power," this "intelligence within [the] psyche" as "God."<sup>181</sup>

Once Kelsey began looking at his dreams, he came to understand that God wanted to speak to him and agrees with Edgar Cayce who asserted that God does not typically speak to us in crystal clear dreams because God "is more interested in having fellowship with us than in giving us information."<sup>182</sup> Kelsey writes, "It was during a difficult time that a friend advised me to pay attention to my dreams. I soon noticed that there was a wisdom greater than mine that spoke to me in my dreams and came to my aid."<sup>183</sup> Sanford believes that dreams "express the

---

<sup>180</sup> Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation*, 195–96.

<sup>181</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God's Forgotten Language*, 13.

<sup>182</sup> Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*, 44.

<sup>183</sup> *Ibid.*, 9.

Mind of God within us,”<sup>184</sup> and Joyce Rockwood Hudson notes that we are not left alone in our struggle to make sense of our dreams.

Our penetration into the meaning [of our dreams] does not depend solely on human skill and knowledge. The message of the dream comes from the realm of God, and the Holy Spirit participates in our understanding of it. It is necessary that we apply ourselves and do our part in working with our dreams, but in the end it is grace working in us that makes the difference and helps us arrive at those insights that we are ready to receive.<sup>185</sup>

Receiving these insights—for modern Christians—may require a shift in theology, doctrine, and world view. Christians will, once again, need to believe—as *Jesus did*—that God desires intimate communication with us and will do so. If we can adopt this view, Kelsey writes, “then our prayer life and meditations can bring us into real relationship with God. The dream can then become meaningful as well as a source of self-knowledge and revelation.”<sup>186</sup>

In a letter to Kelsey, Jung wrote, “What are modern Christians to make of dreams, then, when we have opened our minds in this way to the possibility that they may speak to us of something beyond or different from our conscious egos?”<sup>187</sup> The fruits of understanding dreams, for Kelsey, are “new vitality” and a “new dimension” to our religious lives.<sup>188</sup> He witnessed the power of dreams to transform over and over again both as a professor at the University of Notre Dame and in his congregational ministry. He writes,

As I have shared this path with others, first with the congregation at St. Luke’s in Monrovia, then with the students of Notre Dame, and then in many years of lecturing, I found that many people who took these ideas seriously found a new vitality in their religious lives, a new meaning to prayer and a new incentive to actions of caring and social justice. Agnostic students at Notre Dame could no longer maintain their stance when they recorded the mystery and depth of their dream life and many returned to their Christian roots. Once they took the dream seriously from a religious point of view, they found a whole new realm of

---

<sup>184</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language*, 173–74.

<sup>185</sup> Joyce Rockwood Hudson, *Natural Spirituality: Recovering the Wisdom Tradition in Christianity*, 2nd ed. (Danielsville, GA: JRH Publications, 2001), 98.

<sup>186</sup> Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation*, 195.

<sup>187</sup> *Ibid.*, 196.

<sup>188</sup> Kelsey, *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*, 3.

religious experience and interest opened to them through contact with something beyond the bounds of the ordinary church practice they had known.<sup>189</sup>

### **The God Encountered in Dreams**

Clearly, dream work offers great potential for positive outcomes, but is there anything about which we should be cautious? For some individuals, focusing on one's inner life can become all-consuming, such that one can risk losing proper perspective on the value of outer life. Hudson suggests that people who tend to give "too much weight" to their dreams need to learn that "life proceeds from life, not from dreams. "Life has its own reality," she reminds us, "with one real moment leading to the next. Dreams do their work on the inside, beneath the surface, helping us understand things more clearly, giving us hints and helpful leads...[but one must pay attention to what outer life is saying because] life proceeds from life and no other way."<sup>190</sup> Those who have not done inner work might be suspicious that such work could lead one to become too self-centered. But Sanford expresses clearly that the opposite is true:

Sometimes people ask, 'But doesn't this preoccupation with yourself make you all the more egocentric?' It would if we were only preoccupied with our own ego, that is, with only our own personal, selfish desires. But when we expose [ourselves] to dream analysis we subordinate our ego to a psychic principle of greater importance, and this can be baffling, painful, and humiliating. Egocentricity is reduced rather than increased, for we have to take second place to a greater psychic reality than that of our own ego<sup>191</sup>...Throughout this process of realizing the whole person within us we will be vexed by the need for a continual and painful surrender of our egocentricity. For this is not a process the ego commands, but which it serves; the conscious mind must accept, and consider, the higher authority: the God within. And if this God is identical with the final order and meaning of the universe, then our dreams express the will of the transcendent God as well.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup> Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation*, 213.

<sup>190</sup> Hudson, *Natural Spirituality*, 95–96.

<sup>191</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God's Forgotten Language*, 63.

<sup>192</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

For Kelsey, those who would apply Jungian methods to their own journey must, by necessity, undergo the same kind of direct confrontation with God that Jung himself underwent. Jung described this as “on the one hand a bloody struggle, on the other supreme ecstasy”; “God alone was real,” he wrote, “an annihilating fire and an indescribable grace.” “Most of modern Christianity,” concludes Kelsey, “has forgotten the reality of such encounters, which are very painful, and it does not choose to be reminded.”<sup>193</sup> Sanford, too, sees dealing with our dreams as “an exacting and demanding task.

Not without reason do we fear God, for who knows when God may want to make a Moses out of us, send us on some impossible inner task, and threaten us with destruction if we try to evade it. If you expect in dealing with dreams to find the beneficent, fuzzy-minded deity of much conventional religion you will be greatly surprised. The author of our dreams is a demanding deity...if you are looking for an easy way out, you will not want to deal with unconscious psychic reality...[Yet] for most of us, it is less dangerous to deal with God directly than to compel God to thrust us forcibly into the way that is set before us.<sup>194</sup>

### **Dreams, Re-enchantment, and Belonging**

When he was a young boy, Stephen Aizenstat’s great-grandfather used to tell him that *everything*—even the knife he used in his shoe-making business—was alive. Aizenstat, psychologist and founding president of the Pacifica Graduate Institute in Santa Barbara, California, was led as an adult by a dream to a book about his deceased great-grandfather housed in the attic of his great-aunt that ignited a lifetime journey focusing on the importance of dreams and the inner nature of humans.<sup>195</sup> Yet much in our modern culture rejects dreams and anything else that is not sensate and measurable as superstition and fantasy.

---

<sup>193</sup> Kelsey, *God, Dreams, and Revelation*, 186.

<sup>194</sup> Sanford, *Dreams: God’s Forgotten Language*, 14.

<sup>195</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 4–6.

Whereas “primal humans experienced a strong, meaningful, and continuous connection to the world around them,”<sup>196</sup> modern humans have been “thrown out of our Eden, forgotten our place in the world, and been severed from the wisdom of its dreamlike consciousness.”<sup>197</sup> Even our experience of the animal world separates non-human beings into either “dangerous, invading killers, or as sterilized, domesticated pets that have had the wildness systematically bred out of them.”<sup>198</sup> The rise of modern science, Aizenstat claims, has both been a tremendous boon to human civilization and radically transformed its “philosophical underpinnings” as it “nearly deified the supremacy of the human mind—not the mind in its totality, but only its narrow, logical, rational, linear aspects.”<sup>199</sup> All other mental aspects such as “intuition, dreams, emotions, play, and so forth” have been “devalued and marginalized” as “childish, backward, fuzzy, naïve, and even dangerous.”<sup>200</sup>

In today’s world, skepticism abounds. On the other hand, an earthquake within one’s life experience can sometimes have the power to reduce one’s skepticism to rubble. Hudson encountered such an experience in the middle of her life when a series of events that were rich in both symbolic and existential meaning associated with the death of a close friend threw her into a tailspin. She writes,

This tragedy marked the end for me of the world I had always known and that everyone around me seemed only to know—a world in which human consciousness is the highest source of knowledge and human will is the greatest purposeful power, religious statements ascribing higher knowledge and power to God notwithstanding...As for myself, I knew more absolutely than I had ever known anything that these events were not merely coincidental. And so I was left stranded alone on the shore of a new world, a world in which a reality greater than any human reality orchestrates mercies to accompany tragedies, a world in which spiritual gifts flow copiously from death, not simply in a vague, ethereal way, but

---

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., 145.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid., 146.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid.

in a real, embodied way. On that tragic and transforming day, I realized that I was standing more directly in the presence of God than I had ever thought possible, that all of us were, and that the meaning of God's presence in our lives was more all-pervasive than even the Church had ever taught me it could be.<sup>201</sup>

Yet when she sought help within the Church that could explain these and subsequent paradigm-shifting events, Hudson found none. While church membership and attendance in the United States continues to plummet, attendance at the Haden Institute Summer Dream & Spirituality Conference continues to rise every year, and attendees regularly report encountering numinous symbols that speak to them through their dreams, leading to a deeper faith and a richer life.

In this section on a mystical view of dreams, I have shown how dreams can be connected to God (understood as transpersonal reality), meaning, value, belonging, and transformation because dream symbols spring from archetypal or transpersonal reality but are not just of historic origin because dreams and dream images are numinous, purposive, and carry guidance and healing. Dreams connect us to an extra-individual transpersonal reality that is encountered within as an objective other and that reality is concerned with, and interested in, our individual and communal wholeness and flourishing.

## SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have shown how including psychological, scientific, communal, and mystical views allow us to connect dreaming and/or dream work to an embodied experience of value, belonging, and transformation, and therefore how a practice of dream work, especially when done in small groups, can foster human wholeness and flourishing. If we can conclude that interpreting one's dreams is a labor that *works*—that doing so allows one to gain something of value from one's dreams or make substantive and life-enhancing changes—and if there are

---

<sup>201</sup> Hudson, *Natural Spirituality*, 6.

specific tools and methods that can be employed, then there is no reason why we cannot claim the resources of dream work to be a worthy practical companion for the theoretical and empirical resources of this project. Even so, there are limitations that may be obstacles to a practice of dream work being embraced by those in the Church and even by those who are “spiritual but not religious.” Those limitations include:

- (1) The generally-held modernist worldview rejects any traditional God-world relationship that would validate spiritual dream work;
- (2) Generally-held Christian theology does not support taking either biblical or contemporary dreaming seriously;
- (3) Jungian psychology does not provide an explanatory metaphysical framework to understand how formal elements like archetypes and their role in dream symbol formation can influence human behavior without seeing them as supernatural and coercive or how Jung’s archetypal Self can be an “image of God” in the psyche;
- (4) The Christian church has not yet embraced a metaphysical theology that shows how *value*, *relationality*, and *positive transformation* are key aspects of embodied reality.

Even so, I, like Aizenstat, am “convinced that tending dreams holds great promise for the future”<sup>202</sup> and so the remainder of this project will prove how an interweaving of Whiteheadian and Jungian thought provides a fruitful theoretical-empirical framework within which spiritual dream work—informed and generatively advanced by such a framework—can become a transformative *relational-imaginal praxis for psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing*.

---

<sup>202</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 8.

## CHAPTER 6:

### SYNTHESIS

#### INTRODUCTION

Although the underlying methodological framework for this project is what Christ and Plaskow describe as the embodied theological method, there are several methods used throughout this work. In Chapter 1, an analytical method was used to describe the lived realities of modern life in the United States and develop a theory to explain the fragmentation identified as the problem. In Chapter 2, high-level comparisons were drawn between Whitehead and Jung to establish their congeniality as theoretical and empirical resources. In Chapters 3-5, a hermeneutical approach was used to explore the meaning and value of Whitehead's and Jung's systems of thought and of various views of dreaming and dream work in relation to their abilities to help individuals experience *value*, *belonging*, and positive *transformation*. In this chapter, we will return to a comparative approach in which functional resonances are brought to light as especially related to the tension between the vision of transpersonal reality and the fact of the historical past.

#### FUNCTIONAL RESONANCES

When proposing linkages or *resonances* between Whitehead and Jung, we must keep in mind that each engaged in speculation to one degree or another about the nature of reality although from differing bases of observation or experience. While Whitehead developed his own terminology to theoretically describe the metaphysical workings of the cosmos, Jung developed his terminology to empirically describe the workings of the human psyche. It is therefore not



particularly helpful to assert or dispute whether there are direct one-to-one correlations between terms or concepts from each school of thought; a more fruitful exercise is to connect the functions each thinker used his terminology to describe.

As was more fully detailed in Chapter 2, the term *resonance* is used in this work in the musical sense to connote sympathetic vibration and potential harmony; here it suggests *congruence* rather than identity or equivalence. Again, *resonance is evocation*. With this tuning fork in hand, we are searching for ways in which an aspect of Whiteheadian thought evokes a sympathetic harmony or movement in Jungian thought and vice versa. Approaching Whitehead and Jung functionally in this section does not dismiss the importance of theory or metaphysics; in fact, it gives Whiteheadians and Jungians the freedom to consider each other as a potential dance partners while remaining true to their own theoretical frames. On this dance floor, the best partners always remain distinctly “other” and alluringly exotic while still being willing to make the functional moves required for the dance to be graceful, beautiful, and successful.

Within Whitehead’s metaphysical and Jung’s psychological frameworks we find:

- Primacy of experience, and of the body, feeling, aesthetics, and value
- An understanding of God as both immanent primordial experience and transcendent vision and value where what is transcendent is transpersonal but not supernatural
- Formal causes that are not deterministic in a co-creative environment of real freedom
- An orientation toward positive change, creative advance, and a zest for life
- An appreciation of the undeniable power of the past balanced by the lure of the possible
- The restoration of meaning, value, and purpose to the world without nullifying multiplicity and diversity

In this project, I am not attempting to remake Whitehead into a Jungian nor Jung into a Whiteheadian. Paraphrasing Rowland's description of her comparative approach to Jung and Jacques Lacan,<sup>1</sup> I too am not attempting to "translate" Jung or Whitehead entirely "into the presuppositions and conclusions" of the other "for that would be to belie both the complexity and 'difference'" of each's work—there is not necessarily a "complete meeting" of the two theories. However, in the cause of constructing transformative relational-imaginal theory and praxis for psycho-spiritual wholeness that foster healing religious experience, there are "suggestive echoes" and "correspondences" between the two thinkers that can then be fruitfully applied to our understanding of the dreaming body-mind and what it reveals. For example, both systems understand that:

- God and one's past world can be encountered as "other" at the depths of experience
- The subject is constituted by encounter with such objective "others"—the stubborn facts of the past, the collective unconscious—that must be integrated into the individual subject's experience
- Unconscious experience precedes conscious experience and is of high value
- The individual's purpose is to attain distinctive value, intensity of experience, zest for life, and integration of multiplicity and contrasting forces
- Value is communicated through aesthetic patterns or images that are dynamic and laden with emotion
- Such emotion-laden value is persuasive, and proposes possibilities that may be novel and creative

---

<sup>1</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 109.

- Novel possibilities for wholeness and value attainment are given through the presence of God in the world and in the individual
- God's presence in the individual is not coercive and possibilities offered are not determinative; the individual entity is free to choose its response, resulting in the potential for evil, wounding, and alienation
- Greater value and wholeness can be attained through an individual stance of respect for, alignment with, and actualization of God's creative possibilities

Chapter 1 identified three requirements that a successful synthesis of theoretical, empirical, and practical resources must meet to address the fragmentation and alienation that is the reality of modern life. Such a synthesis must show: (1) that individual humans *matter*, and can experience *value* and meaning; (2) that we *belong*, that we are inherently and intimately *related* to God and the world; and, (3) that we are not defined by our wounds, but can experience *transformation* or positive change. This chapter will demonstrate how a synthesis of Whiteheadian and Jungian thought offers a transpersonal reality that is one of formalism with freedom. In the subsequent constructive chapter, this synthesis and the addition of dream-related practical resources results in the ability to construct: (1) a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*; and (2) a theory of *a relational-imaginal God-Self in the human being*, understood as the historic route of initial aims.

## **TRANSPERSONAL REALITY AND HISTORICAL PRESSURE**

Probably the key area in which Whitehead and Jung show a remarkable degree of resonance is in the way in which they describe the functions of transpersonal reality and the pressure and power of the past. In this section, I will advance Odin's suggestion of functional

resonances between Whitehead's dipolar God and Jung's collective unconscious, and in their reliance on formalism with forms as transcendent in the sense of being transpersonal without being considered ideal. I will also further Maxwell's comparison of eternal objects and archetypes by showing how functional resonances between their systems are only possible when archetypes and eternal objects are distinguished from archetypal images and propositions and propositional feelings, the latter trio of which are definitively related to history and contextual relevance.

### **Dipolar God and Collective Unconscious**

Whitehead describes the nature of God as "dipolar...[God] has a primordial nature and a consequent nature." God's *primordial* nature is "infinite," "free," "conceptual," "eternal" and "unconscious"; this aspect of God is impersonal and its appetite is for "intensity and not preservation." In similar fashion, Jung asserts that the collectively unconscious aspect of psychic reality "is not a demonic monster, but

a thing of nature that is perfectly neutral as far as moral sense, aesthetic taste and intellectual judgment go...A fundamental mistake, and one which is commonly made, is this: it is supposed that the contents of the unconscious are unequivocal and are marked with plus or minus signs that are immutable. As I see the question, this view is too naive. The psyche is a self-regulating system that maintains itself in equilibrium as the body does.<sup>2</sup>

In connecting Whitehead's primordial God with Hillman's understanding of the collective unconscious, Slusser writes

Perhaps there is some comparability between Whitehead's notion of the Primordial Nature of God, which is the locus of the eternal objects—those forms of definiteness capable of specifying the character of actual entities—and Hillman's notion that 'we can imagine nothing, or perform nothing that is not already formally given by the archetypal imagination of the Gods'? And in turn

---

<sup>2</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 17.

compare that phrase...with the Whiteheadian idea that ‘God originates with his *conceptual* valuation of the timeless realm of eternal objects.’”<sup>3</sup>

Whitehead decried Christian theology’s removal of God from the world as the Absolute or Unmoved Mover. Thus, whereas God’s primordial nature “is unmoved by love for this particular, or that particular” and concerned only that each occasion experience “depth of satisfaction,” God’s *consequent* “tenderness” is very moved by particulars and “directed towards each actual occasion as it arises.”<sup>4</sup> God as consequent is “temporal,” “determined,” “actual,” “physical” and “conscious.” Like Whitehead, Jung believed that a God unaffected by the world is a God of no consequence whatsoever.

‘Absolute’ means ‘cut off,’ ‘detached.’ To assert that God is absolute amounts to placing him outside all connection with man. Man cannot affect him, or he man. Such a God would be of no consequence at all...this urge to regard God as ‘absolute’ derives solely from the fear that God might become ‘psychological.’ This would naturally be dangerous. An absolute God, on the other hand, does not concern us in the least, whereas a ‘psychological’ God would be *real*.<sup>5</sup>

According to Steve Odin, Jung’s collective unconscious is not “a reified entity,” but “an archetypal imagination” and “dynamic image-making function.” Jung saw his depth-psychology as a “‘phenomenology of the imagination,’ which proceeded through a careful observation and description of imagery flowing from the unconscious psyche during dreams, fantasies, and visions, or as manifest in the primordial symbolism of transcultural mythology.”<sup>6</sup> Along with Odin, we can connect the collective unconscious’ function of ancestral memory with Whitehead’s consequent God.<sup>7</sup> Jung noted that he found “abundant evidence” in his study of his

---

<sup>3</sup> Gerald H. Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” in *Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 88.

<sup>4</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, ed. David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne, Corrected (New York, London: Free Press, 1979), 343.

<sup>5</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 77.

<sup>6</sup> Steve Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism: A Critical Study of Cumulative Penetration vs. Interpenetration* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1982), 171.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 168.

patients' imagery for "the existence of a kind of absolute knowledge in the collective unconscious, including a remembrance of all forgotten knowledge of the past as revealed by the extraordinary quantity of archaic vestiges and ancestral memories arising in dreams and fantasies, as well as a prodigious knowledge of the future revealed through anticipatory dreams and visions."<sup>8</sup> There is no clean break between the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious; rather, there is a fluidity between the two; but at its "wider and broader base," the collective unconscious encompasses "contents which are held in common by the family, by the social group, by tribe and nation, by race and eventually by all of humanity...it is all there, all the legend and history of the human race...all within each one of us..."<sup>9</sup>

It is also possible to connect the way that Whitehead's dipolar God perceives the actual world of every occasion and orders eternal objects or possibilities based on their relevance to that actual world to the functional role that the Self—one of the archetypes of the collective unconscious—plays in the compensatory nature of the psyche. Here we might say that the Self "prehends" the individual's actual world and conscious attitude, recognizes what is lacking, and then presents forms that activate our image-making function to represent unconscious material. Ulanov calls the unconscious an "extraordinary source of knowledge," and describes this phenomenon as the "precision and succinctness of the matching of unconscious response to conscious need." When an analyst accompanies an analysand in witnessing that process, she describes it as a "moving" and "impressive experience."

The discovery that so astonishes both persons is that the unconscious does present things specifically addressed to—we could even say custom made for—this particular analysand. Whether through symptom, symbol, or dream, the analysand

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 164.

<sup>9</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 104.

feels summoned—some force or power or someone is communicating. ‘Look!’ it says.<sup>10</sup>

Similarly, Whitehead understood the flourishing of higher grade organisms to occur through alignment with God’s initial aim and through the integrative activities leading to consciousness in intellectual feelings and thereby to rational thought. Moreover, Whitehead described that one could experience “religious intuitions” which are “intuitive feelings of the consequent nature of God and God’s love for the world.”<sup>11</sup>

### **Formalism in Whitehead and Jung**

In his comparative essay on eternal objects and archetypes, Maxwell suggests that while, on the surface, Whitehead’s “engagement with cosmos” and Jung’s “engagement with psyche” may seem to have “virtually nothing in common,” the “deepest intimations” of their work suggest a “convergence,” especially as related to formal causation.<sup>12</sup> In Whitehead’s cosmology, the term applied to the idea of formal causes is “eternal objects,” an idea that is functionally resonant with Jung’s “archetypes,” yet it must be noted that Whitehead regarded his entire “categorical scheme” as “eternal formal causes of everything that occurs.”<sup>13</sup> The formalism embraced by both men is teleological: Whitehead’s “subjective aim is a final rather than an efficient cause” and his creative process includes both the “givenness” of the past and the “possibility” of initial and subjective aims<sup>14</sup>; similarly, Jung’s archetypes “possess a

---

<sup>10</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 6–8.

<sup>11</sup> Thomas E. Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1993), 201–2.

<sup>12</sup> Grant Maxwell, “Archetype and Eternal Object: Jung, Whitehead, and the Return of Formal Causation,” *Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 3 (Winter 2011): 51–52.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 57.

<sup>14</sup> Anil Kumar Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives: Ways and Prospects of Process-Philosophy* (Patna: Bharati Bhawan, 1974), 26, 29–30.

‘foreknowledge’...of the envisioned goal”<sup>15</sup> and press for the actualization of their potentialities “though the specific forms in which they manifest are not determined.”<sup>16</sup>

Maxwell wisely does not contend that archetypes and eternal objects have a “one-to-one correlation,” pointing to Hillman’s description of archetypes as “clusters or constellations [of] a host of events from different areas of life” as the basis for supposing that archetypes “are more complex agglomerations of qualities than the simple qualities enumerated by Whitehead.”<sup>17</sup>

Moreover, Hosinski indicates that eternal objects can be conceptually realized by God in “relationships of diversity and pattern”<sup>18</sup> that may be combined. Another difference is that Jung primarily discussed archetypes as related to human behavior, and did not consider them a basic metaphysical category to describe the way in which everything that is actualized exhibits qualities—although, as was highlighted earlier, he understood archetypes at their most basic as related to differentiation and the primary counting numbers, and also saw them as infusing all of life with patterns of value and meaning that become evident in experiences of synchronicity. For Jung, archetypes are “pre-existent forms” that exist in the collective unconscious to serve as “organizing principles”<sup>19</sup> that help shape “conscious contents by regulating, modifying, and motivating them”<sup>20</sup>; they serve as ready-made templates of “emotional possibilities of response.”<sup>21</sup> He saw them as “connected with the instincts” because humans are “biological being[s]” that must “act in a specifically human way and fulfill [the human] pattern of behavior.”<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Liliane Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung: A Comparative Study of the Psychology of the Unconscious* (Boston: Shambhala, 2001), 97.

<sup>16</sup> Maxwell, “Archetype and Eternal Object,” 58.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 59.

<sup>18</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 167.

<sup>19</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 127.

<sup>20</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 95.

<sup>21</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 98.

<sup>22</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 90.



Instinct and the archaic mode meet in the biological conception of the ‘pattern of behavior.’ There are in fact no amorphous instincts, as every instinct bears in itself the pattern of its situation. Always it fulfills an image, and the image has fixed qualities. The instinct of the leaf-cutting ant fulfills the image of ant, tree, leaf, cutting, transport, and the little ant garden of fungi. If any of these conditions is lacking, the instinct does not function, because it cannot exist without its total pattern, without its image. Such an image is an *a priori* type. It is inborn in the ant prior to any activity for there can be no activity at all unless an instinct of corresponding pattern initiates and makes it possible.<sup>23</sup>

Such is also true of humans who must have a “psychic phenomenology” that is uniquely human, for, as Jung argues, “No biologist would ever dream of assuming that each individual acquires its general mode of behavior afresh each time.”<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, archetypes and instincts are “polar opposites” with an incredibly close “correspondence” that ties meaning to instinct and “underlies all psychic energy.”<sup>25</sup> Whitehead does write of human “habits of behavior” and “habits of interpretation” that first incarnate in human history from “penumbral” stirrings,<sup>26</sup> a possible intimation of resonance with Jung. Noting that Hillman sees archetypes as “best comparable with a God” because they are “personified modes of potential meaning, applicable, like metaphor, on many levels of experience,” Maxwell prefers to see them as “both persons and impersonal forces” from the “transtemporal domain” that yet manifest temporally and specifically.<sup>27</sup>

### **Transcendent Forms**

While describing anything as “transcendent,” “abstract,” or “universal” seems to fly in the faces of both feminism and a project that claims an embodied theological methodology, such terms are metaphorically appropriate for the functions of eternal objects and archetypes. “Every

---

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 122.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 97.

<sup>26</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, Paperback (New York: The Free Press, 1933), 249–50.

<sup>27</sup> Maxwell, “Archetype and Eternal Object,” 60.

eternal object transcends the entity which it forms,” writes Mattingly, because it can recur “at other times and places” and “suggest alternatives which might have been actualized but were not”; in this sense they are “abstract.”<sup>28</sup> Because eternal objects exist “in potency everywhere”<sup>29</sup> and are repeatable in successive actual entities while not being exhausted, they are considered “universals.”<sup>30</sup> They are universally-available and “realizable at any time”<sup>31</sup> *without being normative* for every time or every circumstance. Critical for feminism and embodiment, eternal objects, notes Faber, “do not represent some ultimate reality”—in their abstract and transcendent state they are “neither active nor concrete,” and “are real solely in events and event nexuses.” They do not represent the “essence” of events, argues Faber, “they instead *make it possible* for events to become what their ‘essence’ is.”<sup>32</sup> Neither, notes Odin, is the archetypal realm “ideal” or “more real than the order of physical actuality as is usually implicit in Platonic schemes of thought.” The archetypal imagination, like the primordial nature of Whitehead’s God, “is fully real, in the deepest meaning of the word ‘real,’ [but] it is nonetheless actually deficient or devoid of physical feeling.”<sup>33</sup> Jung acknowledged his critics who questioned the “existence” of the archetypes:

Certainly they do not exist, any more than a botanical system exists in nature! But will anyone deny the existence of natural plant-families on that account? Or will anyone deny the occurrence and continual repetition of certain morphological and functional similarities? It is much the same thing in principle with the typical figures of the unconscious. They are forms existing *a priori*, or biological norms of psychic activity.<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> Susan Shotliff Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects” (PhD, University of Texas at Austin, 1968), 100, 138.

<sup>29</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 40.

<sup>30</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 101.

<sup>31</sup> Roland Faber, *God as Poet of the World: Exploring Process Theologies* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 86.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 86–87.

<sup>33</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 175.

<sup>34</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 100.

A suggestion that Whitehead would not equate eternal objects with archetypes *ontologically* is that stressed by Keller and Cobb, who believe that a Whiteheadian rendering of archetypes makes them historical, contingent, and capable of transformation, whereas Jung and Hillman, although sometimes speaking of them as rooted in history, often treat them as eternal and necessary.<sup>35</sup>

Yet Singer disagrees, noting that to use a word like “necessary” is to make a value judgment that scientists like Jung are typically not willing to make. Instead, she prefers to talk about the archetypes as “useful categories for thinking about the vast images which help us to organize our life experience in ways that point toward their ultimate meaning.”<sup>36</sup> Additionally, in a personal conversation, Jungian analyst Jerry R. Wright noted that Jung would not necessarily have considered archetypes “eternal,” because though their “forms” remained the same, their “contents” (the living symbols they present to the psyche) change over time. Kelsey understands Jung as seeing Plato’s “ideas, not as eternal concepts, but rather as the philosophical version of his ‘psychically concrete’ archetypes.”<sup>37</sup> For Griffin, another point of difference revolves around whether archetypes can be “socially constructed” or are always essentially of divine origin.<sup>38</sup> If we examine this more closely, we find that both eternal objects and archetypes, in and of themselves, are *ahistorical* while the images they produce are *contextual*.

Mattingly notes that an eternal object “cannot be described ‘in itself,’ in abstraction from any specific involvement in actuality” but can only be described “in terms of its potentiality for ‘ingression’” in an actual entity.<sup>39</sup> Similarly, Shelburne describes archetypes as having “the

---

<sup>35</sup> David Ray Griffin, “Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 75.

<sup>36</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 129.

<sup>37</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 110.

<sup>38</sup> Griffin, “Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements,” 59.

<sup>39</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 132.

ontological status of a hypothetical construct” and, like an electron, “the archetype can be detected only through the effects which it produces”: those effects are the “archetypal image and the instinctual behavior.”<sup>40</sup> Because he recorded the images that arose in his patients’ dreams and fantasies, Jung initially equated the images with the archetypes and his earlier work conflates the two. But his later writing reflects an evolution of the concept and a differentiation between the unknowable archetypes and the “personal or cultural”<sup>41</sup> images that arose. The unconscious—*being unconscious*—is “beyond examination,” so Jung “could only infer its structure from the unconscious material that emerged into consciousness.”<sup>42</sup> As *unconscious*, archetypes cannot be directly perceived *by* human consciousness, but only indirectly perceived through their effect *on* consciousness.<sup>43</sup> Like the mathematical model some assume is behind objective reality, archetypes are “invisible and irrepresentable.”<sup>44</sup>

### **Historicity, Relevance, and Novel Aims**

While eternal objects and archetypes in and of themselves are abstract, transcendent, and universal, Jung recognized that once the image arises, it already “differs to an indeterminable extent from that which caused the representation.”<sup>45</sup> Robertson gives the example that all complex animals seem to have “an archetype for Mother” that leads them to “instinctively know a great deal about what to expect from a Mother.” It is also useful to recall that zoologist Konrad Lorenz found that the lived experience of an orphaned baby goose could stretch its expectations

---

<sup>40</sup> Robin Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes: Jung, Gödel, and the History of Archetypes*, Revised (New York: iUniverse, 2009), 168.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, 165–66.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 165.

<sup>43</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 37.

<sup>44</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 106.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*

to accommodate the maternal imprint it formed to “the very un-gooselike Lorenz.”<sup>46</sup> Once an archetype has made itself manifest in one’s personal images, that “immediate manifestation,

as we encounter it in dreams and visions, is much more individual, less understandable, and more naive than in myths, for example. The archetype is essentially an unconscious content that is altered by becoming conscious and by being perceived, and it takes color from the individual consciousness in which it happens to appear.<sup>47</sup>

In other words, only archetypes are universal and ahistorical; the *images* that arise from them are contextual and temporal. Such images may, in fact, become “collective” or “common to entire people or epochs.”<sup>48</sup>

Eternal objects are “forms of definiteness” that make each actual entity one thing versus another; they “[invest] the datum with the individuality of the subject.”<sup>49</sup> Every “drop of experience” involves eternal objects, and they are responsible for introducing what is “new” into concrete reality.<sup>50</sup> As Mattingly argues, eternal objects *must*, in fact, exist “outside the historical process altogether,” otherwise there could be no possibility of genuine novelty.<sup>51</sup> Jung recognized this in terms of human behavior as well, and so proposed two ways in which the archetypes came into existence. On the one hand, notes Robertson, at least some archetypes must exist as possibilities before they are actualized in conscious events, otherwise, “how else to explain the creativity of the psyche?” Times when “something bursts forth into consciousness that is the ‘best possible expression at the moment for a fact as yet unknown’” can only be understood as novel. On the other hand, Jung recognized that problems that have engaged “most

---

<sup>46</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 166.

<sup>47</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 361.

<sup>48</sup> Charles R. Card, “The Archetypal View of C.G. Jung and Wolfgang Pauli,” *Psychological Perspectives* 24, no. Spring-Summer 1991 (1991): 22.

<sup>49</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 154.

<sup>50</sup> Bernard J. Lee, *The Becoming of the Church: A Process Theology of the Structures of Christian Experience* (New York: Paulist Press, 1974), 66.

<sup>51</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 99.

of humanity over a long period of time” have been invested with great “emotional energy” and these “oft-repeated events leave a trail in the [human] psyche.”<sup>52</sup> Odin, too, understands archetypes as both “preformed organization patterns by means of which the mind orders its contents” and as “psychically inherited vestiges or ancestral memories transmitted since antiquity.”<sup>53</sup> In a resonant way, Whitehead understands eternal objects as capable of being prehended both directly from God as a—possibly novel—initial aim *and* via their actualization in past, objective fact and superjective actual entities. Functionally, then, we can consider archetypes, like eternal objects, to be both *atemporal*, and *universal* abstractions as well as having a *temporal* and embodied inheritance.

Yet eternal objects do not “float” into the world from nowhere of their own accord; no, they are envisaged for particular occasions based on their relevance within the ongoing historical process to that forming entity. “Each eternal object,” wrote Whitehead, “has a definite, effective relevance to each concrescent process. Apart from such orderings, there would be a complete disjunction of eternal objects unrealized in the temporal world. Novelty would be meaningless, and inconceivable.”<sup>54</sup> Who is doing the envisaging and what determines relevance? For Whitehead, the answer is God, yet this is not a God outside of time and unrelated to the world; this is a God who is an actual entity “which can provide for the actual effectiveness of the pure potentials without destroying their status as pure potentialities and with it their capacity to explain genuine novelty in the world.”<sup>55</sup>

This point is crucial: true novelty in the world is only explainable if possibilities exist as pure potentials before they are actualized for the first time. As Lee writes, “without eternal

---

<sup>52</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 148–49.

<sup>53</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 162.

<sup>54</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 40.

<sup>55</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 99.

objects, there is no room for the appearance of the really ‘New’ in concrete actuality—there would be only the already actual to draw upon and to arrange and rearrange.”<sup>56</sup> Ontologically, it is not clear if Jung envisioned archetypes as capable of introducing novelty. On the one hand, he wrote that “there is not a single important idea or view that does not possess historical antecedents”<sup>57</sup>; on the other hand, he wrote that “certain ideas exist almost everywhere and at all times and can even spontaneously create themselves quite independently of migration or tradition.”<sup>58</sup> Regardless, on the level of function, we know that Jung stressed the creativity of the compensatory psyche and its capacity to generate possibilities—via the transcendent function operating through the archetypal Self, or God-image in the psyche—that are novel in the life of an individual. At the deepest level, the entire collective unconscious—or archetypal imagination—is an “atemporal envisagement” of the forms that gives rise to “archetypal symbols or primordial images.”<sup>59</sup> Frey-Rohn reminds us that Jung thought the archetypes to be “not only the focal point of ancient pathways but also the center from which new creative endeavors emanated.”<sup>60</sup>

As well, in God’s role of providing each entity its initial subjective aim to exist, God “accounts for the orderly progress of the temporal world.”<sup>61</sup> In process thought, every actual entity (or “drop of experience”) makes a decision that “constitutes its own definiteness” in relation to some kind of aim or purpose, “otherwise there would be random chaos” rather than meaning in existence. If the end was determined strictly by the past, then there would be no actual freedom or true novelty. Rather, the “end” actually comes from the future as a lure or

---

<sup>56</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 66.

<sup>57</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 396.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 585.

<sup>59</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 172.

<sup>60</sup> Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung*, 95.

<sup>61</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 137.

possibility, and it is God who “so orders possibility as to render it into a relevant lure for each new experience.”<sup>62</sup> It is this lure—without coercion—that constitutes there even being decision, such that there is more “order and direction and novelty” in life than could be possible if all were determined by the past or by chance.<sup>63</sup> The purposeful end or “aim” that comes as the lure from the future is called the “initial aim” or “initial subjective aim.” It is the initial aim that “makes possible the commencement of process, and which therefore makes reality possible.”<sup>64</sup> This aim is a “hybrid physical feeling”—meaning that it is a physical prehension or ingression of God’s conceptual feeling;<sup>65</sup> it is both the entity’s “living immediacy” and its initial standard for experiencing and determining value.<sup>66</sup> For Lee, the initial aim is “God’s purpose at work,” and it is through this aim that value, intensity, harmony, and beauty enter the world, “which is to say that creative *advance* is the overall characteristic of process.”<sup>67</sup>

As it would be impossible for forming entities to survey the entire realm of possibilities for their actualization, God is therefore the actual entity who possesses the agency to order the “real potentials for actualization by the developing subject.”<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, God does not “create” the eternal objects but requires them for God to be God. Quoting Whitehead, Mattingly shows how the “transcendence of form” or the “World of Value” is balanced by “the immanence of God” in the temporal “World of Fact.”

The basic elements in the World of Fact are finite activities; the basic character of the World of Value is its timeless coordination of the infinitude of possibility *for realization*. In the Universe the status of the World of Fact is that of an abstraction

---

<sup>62</sup> John B. Cobb Jr., “Spiritual Discernment in a Whiteheadian Perspective,” in *Religious Experience and Process Theology: The Pastoral Implications of a Major Modern Movement*, ed. Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 358.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 359.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>65</sup> Donald W. Sherburne, ed., *A Key to Whitehead’s Process and Reality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966), 49.

<sup>66</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 173.

<sup>67</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 94–95.

<sup>68</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 103.



requiring, for the completion of its concrete reality, Value and Purpose. Also in the Universe the status of the World of Value is that of an abstraction *requiring, for the completion of its concrete reality, the factuality of Finite Activity*...The primary basis of the World of Value is the coordination of all possibility *for entry into the active World of Fact*. [emphasis in original]<sup>69</sup>

Moreover, all of this—“the process of transition from one actual entity to another, the process of interaction between God and world...the advance into novelty”—depends upon the “ultimate” that Whitehead terms “creativity.”<sup>70</sup> Such “creativity” may be considered in Jungian terms as the primordial mystery or flow of life.

The “immanence” of eternal objects in the world is “systematically interrelated” but not “logical”; their relationships cannot be explained *by* history but, in fact, are explanatory *of* history.<sup>71</sup> The fact that there is such a thing *as history*—that things are “reasonably together” as an “inter-locked community of events”—is due to the fact that the universe’s creative advance demands that there be “patterns of assemblage” that are aesthetic in nature.<sup>72</sup> In asking why a particular time or epoch “has just the existent, necessary relationships prescribed by the extensive continuum,” Ballard notes that “the present character of the world must be causally dependent upon its past character. Thus prior occasions limit the possibility relevant to the present.”<sup>73</sup> The creative advance can only introduce *relevant* novelty whereby intensity is “heightened” by the presence of the limitation that order ensures when combined with the “harmonic contrasts” that can be introduced without being dismissed as “incompatibles.”<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 144.

<sup>70</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 213–14.

<sup>71</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 155.

<sup>72</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 62.

<sup>73</sup> Edward G. Ballard, “Kant and Whitehead, and the Philosophy of Mathematics,” in *Studies in Whitehead’s Philosophy*, vol. 10, Tulane Studies in Philosophy (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1961), 14.

<sup>74</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 62; Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 166.

Therefore, “novelty and relevance are intertwined.”<sup>75</sup> As already demonstrated, a similar ordering role is performed by the collective unconscious and archetypal Self.

In this section, I have shown how Whitehead’s dipolar God and Jung’s collective unconscious are resonant in that they are both unconscious and conscious, eternal and temporal, and morally neutral while still holding a vision for the world. Both Whitehead’s consequent God and Jung’s collective unconscious are intimately connected to the suffering of the world and retain the world’s history and Whitehead’s primordial God and Jung’s collective unconscious are the source of imagination, vision, and novelty. In both systems, there is a limited teleological nature to existence. Forms are transcendent, transpersonal, and abstract yet they spur contextual and emotionally compelling numinous images that can be experienced as powerfully persuasive even though they are not wholly normative or determinative. While examining resonances in this comparative way is interesting, what value is gained from it? I will next show that the generative vision realized in synthesizing these systems is that of a *relational-imaginal reality of form and freedom*.

### **GENERATIVE SYNTHESIS:**

#### **A RELATIONAL-IMAGINAL REALITY OF FORM AND FREEDOM**

The relationship between Whitehead’s eternal objects and Jung’s archetypes was a point of contention between John Cobb, Catherine Keller, and Stanley Hopper in *The Archetypal Process*. Seeing archetypes as “numinous,” “dynamic,” and “telic” leads Keller to conclude that they cannot be “equated with” Whitehead’s “pure, formal” eternal objects. On the other hand, she, too, ties archetypes to “propositions” and “objective lures for feeling,” noting that in this

---

<sup>75</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 141.

role they may “lend empirical and experiential content to the more formal notion of the initial aim” and can be “causally efficacious” when “symbolized” through the initial aim.<sup>76</sup> Cobb argues that archetypes as “typical forms of behavior” reveal their lack of the neutrality “with respect to ingression” that Whitehead’s eternal objects possess. He therefore places archetypes squarely in the realm of the “causal efficacy of the past,” noting the ability of behavioral repetition to “exercise cumulative force in the present.”<sup>77</sup> Helpfully, Hopper reminds us that “we see all things differently” and notes that Whitehead’s terms are “metaphors” that “mutely [appeal] for an imaginative leap”—it is therefore necessary to speak neither “as a Whiteheadian nor as a Jungian” but, rather, “to explore a zone or an environment in which the two modes of thinking might find some common ground.”<sup>78</sup>

Kenneth Pargament, a leading researcher in spirituality and psychotherapy relates the story of the immunologist he met at a meeting who, when the conversation turned to religion and spirituality, asked “Isn’t religion just a bunch of hormones?” The question, Pargament reflects, reveals “two biases in the medical and social sciences”: one that views “human behavior as largely reactive” to primarily physical forces and one that views religion/spirituality as something reducible to more “real” processes. Yet, he argues, people are “goal-directed” beings who are “guided as much by interest as they are by instinct.”<sup>79</sup> Instincts determine and subsume freedom; goals lure and elevate freedom. Which makes up the bulk of our experience?

---

<sup>76</sup> Catherine E. Keller, “Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 144–45.

<sup>77</sup> John B. Cobb Jr., “Eternal Objects and Archetypes: A Response to Stanley Hopper,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 126.

<sup>78</sup> Stanley R. Hopper, “Language as Metaphorical: A Reply to John Cobb,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 129.

<sup>79</sup> Kenneth I. Pargament, *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy: Understanding and Addressing the Sacred* (New York: The Guilford Press, 2011), 76.

Because eternal objects and archetypes are both atemporal *and* historically realized, they are powerful and persuasive but not necessarily coercively determinative. For Jung, the image “is determined as to its content only when it has become conscious and is therefore filled out with the material of conscious experience”<sup>80</sup> of the individual. “The archetype,” he wrote, “was itself merely a predisposition to form images: ‘The archetype itself is purely formal, nothing but a *facultas praeformandi*, a possibility of representation which is given *a priori*.’”<sup>81</sup> Because neither eternal objects nor archetypes are “actual” they “cannot effect their own realization into the world.

They are dependent for becoming the actual form of definiteness of an occasion upon something else; this something else is in part antecedent actuality [the historical past]. The eternal objects having ingression in past occasions limit the ingression of eternal objects in occasions developing out of the former. Thus, the general potentiality offered by eternal objects is limited or ‘conditioned’ by the occasions preceding in time.<sup>82</sup>

For Whitehead, God as primordial is “the unlimited conceptual realization of the absolute wealth of potentiality” and is “not *before* all creation, but *with* all creation.”<sup>83</sup> Even in the case of eternal objects that are offered in God’s initial aim for an occasion or by the archetypal imagination, Lee notes that such an envisagement is not established “ahead of time for the world” in a determinative way. He describes God’s primordial nature as “his envisagement of the structure of possibilities” but stresses that “each becoming is a free act, as a result of which the texture of reality is modified.”<sup>84</sup> Similarly, Ulanov reminds us that while formal archetypes are “ready-made” they are only “activated by concrete life situations.”<sup>85</sup> In fact, it is God’s very physical prehension in God’s consequent nature of the actual world from which a subject may

---

<sup>80</sup> Card, “The Archetypal View of C.G. Jung and Wolfgang Pauli,” 25.

<sup>81</sup> Demaris S. Wehr, *Jung & Feminism: Liberating Archetypes* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), 51–52.

<sup>82</sup> Ballard, “Kant and Whitehead,” 13.

<sup>83</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 343.

<sup>84</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 89.

<sup>85</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 98.

emerge that joins with God's imagined possibilities for that actual world in that moment to form the "objective lure for feeling" for the subject which is to become.

Physically, the facts of the world along with God's "consequent nature" are prehended or *felt* by the concreting occasion and in this sense, it can be said that the subject is "'efficiently caused' by entities in its past."<sup>86</sup> On the other hand, eternal objects as "envisaged potential"—forms with subjective form or feeling from God's "primordial nature"—engender novelty by entering into, and being positively prehended by, an actual entity through its mental pole. This *given* initial subjective aim—prehended by the subject—is what calls the subject into being in the first place<sup>87</sup> but from that point on, the subject determines the form of its own actualization and, to that degree, is "'finally caused' by itself."<sup>88</sup> Overall, we must say that in God's "multiple unifications of the universe," creations of actualities are "free" but they arise out of "decided situations."<sup>89</sup> As Odin notes, momentary events are "sandwiched-in, as it were, between the primordial and consequent natures of the dipolar God. God initiates each occasion by providing its basic organizational pattern and then everlastingly remembers it as [God's] own past..."<sup>90</sup>

Archetypes are not "superhuman deities" or "extraterrestrials," but do they have "sovereign power" over us, as Jung seems to suggest? If they are "sovereign" in the traditional sense, writes Wehr, "the images would seem an unchangeable part of the divinely ordained order of things, frustratingly unchallengeable."<sup>91</sup> Yet, she continues, the "truest reading here is one that remains on the level of experience; Jung is saying that the images *feel* 'sovereign...'"<sup>92</sup> Jung observed that the archetypal image carries a "certain influence or power by virtue of which it

---

<sup>86</sup> Mattingly, "Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects," 85.

<sup>87</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.*, 85.

<sup>89</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 530.

<sup>90</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 168.

<sup>91</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 93.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*

either exerts a numinous or fascinating effect, or impels to action,” and Liliane Frey-Rohn describes the relationship between the archetype and the conscious psyche as reciprocal in nature: the image “needed to be formed by the conscious ego just as much as, conversely, consciousness required an evocative idea...”<sup>93</sup> Though the images emerge from the psyche itself, “the individual gripped by the experience felt its source to be an extra-conscious psychic reality, presenting the special quality of something ‘illuminating’ and helpful but, at the same time, strange.”<sup>94</sup> Archetypes are not coercive or oppressive because they do not determine the archetypal image to which we respond (or not). Jung made this clear when he wrote,

Again and again I encounter the mistaken notion that an archetype is determined in regard to its content, in other words that it is a kind of unconscious idea (if such an expression be permissible). It is necessary to point out once more that archetypes are not determined as to their content, but only as regards to their form, and then only to a very limited degree. A primordial image is determined as to its content only when it has become conscious and is therefore filled out with the material of conscious experience.<sup>95</sup>

The “numinous images” we encounter are “part of one’s own psyche and experience” and so “do not demand worship,” though a “worshipful attitude” is helpful; “as Buber claimed, Jung’s religion is one of psychic immanence.”<sup>96</sup> In fact, Jung would rarely even talk about God as a Being outside of embodied life, to the point where Martin Buber accused Jung of reducing God to something that only has reality in the psyche. Shelburne agrees that Jung draws a distinction between God as experienced, “the psychic God-image or God archetype, from a possible God entity transcending possible psychic experience to which the God-image could correspond.”<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup> Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung*, 96.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>95</sup> Card, “The Archetypal View of C.G. Jung and Wolfgang Pauli,” 25.

<sup>96</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 95.

<sup>97</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 2, 76.

A synthesis of Whitehead and Jung generates an appreciation of the freedom of actual entities to choose but within a context that demands a certain amount of order and stability with the past. Situating Jung's archetypes within a process metaphysic stretches them "toward their least essentialist, most historical significance" where they become "capable of much more evolution..."<sup>98</sup> Like archetypal images, what Whitehead called *propositions* can only be targeted to "logical subjects" of the "actual world" within which such a proposition is relevant<sup>99</sup>; they are culturally-influenced, and demand a certain amount of conformity to retain stability. Therefore, novel possibilities that go against the status quo will find difficult footing initially. At the same time, "false propositions [those that do not conform with the current actual world] are the instrument of the world's creative advance"<sup>100</sup>—it is key to keep in mind that the goal for Whitehead is contrast with harmony not outright anarchy and chaos. As Mattingly notes, "an emerging entity may not exhibit any novel form but only one which will conserve the general stability contributed by the past."<sup>101</sup> As well, the "character of the past" can be "reproduced and accumulated in the present" through eternal objects that are "re-enacted" in newly forming subjects.<sup>102</sup> Therefore, *normativity* is real, but it lies in the "persuasive power of the empirical and the historical" not in some independent ideal.<sup>103</sup> Even in such cases, the forming subject may adopt a "novel subjective form" of the data it receives and reinterpret it according to its own purposive freedom.<sup>104</sup> While entities are the combination of efficient and final causes—both "objective data and subjective aim"—living entities are permitted *original responses to given*

---

<sup>98</sup> Keller, "Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection," 144.

<sup>99</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 107.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, 108.

<sup>101</sup> Mattingly, "Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects," 136.

<sup>102</sup> Ballard, "Kant and Whitehead," 16.

<sup>103</sup> William D. Dean, "Introduction: From Size to Integrity," in *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, ed. William D. Dean and Larry E. Axel (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 6.

<sup>104</sup> Mattingly, "Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects," 92.

*data* and retain respons-*ability* to “original, novel (in the sense of being previously unactualized) forms of definiteness.”<sup>105</sup> It is this ability which, in fact, differentiates a living from a non-living entity: while non-living entities may only be able to absorb the given environment and adjust slightly for satisfaction, the aim of a living entity is “to create new material, to change the course of its environment.”<sup>106</sup>

As noted at the start of this section, Hopper suggests that “common ground” may be reached between Whiteheadians and Jungians. Here I have shown not only that a “common ground” between these areas exists but that there is a generative synthesis achieved in functionally comparing the formal roles of eternal objects and archetypes, the numinous power of propositions, propositional feelings, and archetypal images, and the relationship of these to the historic pressure of the received past and the lure of novel possibilities. Such a primordial *and* consequent, formal *and* historic, teleological *and* aesthetic-emotional view allows us to embrace formalism *with freedom*.

## SUMMARY

In this chapter, through a functional comparison of Whitehead and Jung and their thought on transpersonal reality and historical pressure, I have shown how we may realize a generative vision of a *relational-imaginal reality of form and freedom*. Why does such a reality matter? It matters because if there are no possibilities for *transformative change* offered us by a transpersonal reality to which we *matter* and in which we *belong*, then there is no point whatsoever in this current project. Even within a project that is so fiercely grounded in *lived experience* and the embodied theological method, it is still necessary to explain *how* and *why*

---

<sup>105</sup> Ibid., 91.

<sup>106</sup> Ibid., 92.



such experience is possible because without such an explanatory framework, then individual experiences of belonging, value, and transformation are reduced to merely individual, subjective and random experiences that may or may not grace our paths. Value, belonging, and the possibility of transformative change *must be woven into the very fabric of existence and understood as such* if there is to be any hope, joy, wholeness, or flourishing to human life.

Part II of this work—*Integration*—has presented theoretical resources that are both metaphysical and empirical and practical resources that give us a toolkit of methods for interpreting our experience through dream work. In Chapter 3, I established Whitehead’s philosophy of organism as a metaphysics that describes an integrated, relational cosmos. In Chapter 4, I established Jung’s analytical psychology as an empirical system that describes an integrated, relational psyche. Chapter 5 established dreaming and dream work as having integrative power, and Chapter 6 synthesized our theoretical resources into one relational-imaginal reality of formalism with freedom thereby giving our practical resources a strong foundation upon which to stand. Now we can understand our individual experiences of *value*, *belonging*, and *transformation* not just as random and elusive but as reflective of *the very nature of reality for every living human being*. It is in this knowledge that we can stand with hope and confidently face a future wherein we may realize wholeness and common flourishing. Having laid this foundation, I can now construct the key elements unique to this project: (1) a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*; (2) a theory of a *relational-imaginal theory of the God-Self* in the human being; and 3) a transformative *relational-imaginal praxis for psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing*.

PART III:  
TRANSFORMATION

CHAPTER 7:  
CONSTRUCTION

**INTRODUCTION**

This work has analyzed the Fragmentation of human life, especially within the context of contemporary life in the United States, and it has proposed an Integration of the theoretical, empirical, and practical resources of Whitehead, Jung, and dreams and dream work. We then took the further step of synthesizing Whitehead and Jung in a generative way so as to offer a *relational-imaginal reality of form and freedom*. It has been a long journey. Finally, we have arrived at Transformation, the destination toward which we pointed this ship in hope and anticipation as soon as we left the port of our Introduction. Here, we can finally construct the pieces that are unique to this project and which offer, I strongly believe, a way out of the lonely and painful wilderness in which we Americans now find ourselves.

This is a constructive chapter that again draws from what I see as functional resonances between Whitehead and Jung. First, I will use their ideas on causal efficacy, the collective unconscious, proposition and propositional feeling, image, emotion, symbol, and perception to build a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming* that relates God and World through perception and dreaming. Next, I will use their views on teleology and God as immanent to construct a theory of a *relational-imaginal God-Self in the human being* that incorporates novelty and creativity, unity and differentiation, and promises the possibility of positive change.

## GOD AND WORLD: PERCEPTION AND DREAMING

In Chapter 5, we discussed psychological, scientific, and mystical approaches to the phenomenon of dreaming as well as the perspective of Christian dream workers. Yet none of these limited perspectives can provide an integrated theory of dreaming that explains how dreams can be understood as embodied while still somehow capable of being perceived as guiding and healing encounters with a transpersonal reality. In constructing what I am calling here a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*, we can interweave the theoretical and empirical resources of Whitehead and Jung to show how dreaming can be understood as a natural function of a perceiving body-mind that (1) receives the entire actual world and God in the mode of causal efficacy with “vector feeling-tone” and (2) combines that emotionally-laden material with archetypal images generated via propositional feelings (a hybrid of the physical prehension of the world with the conceptual prehension of eternal objects or archetypes and “initial aims”). Such relational, emotional, and imaginal elements are then transmitted to the brain where its capacities for exploration, association and metaphor, cognition, simulation, and adaptation can be put to use to advance learning, and emotional memory integration. Moreover, without attempting to definitively prove the physical pathways and processes involved, we will also suggest a potential role of the vagus nerve in transmitting the body’s perception of the world’s feeling-toned information received through causal efficacy to the brain stem where those emotions and “gut instincts” then become part of the brain’s default mode network activation pattern and involved in dreaming processes.

It is primarily because we can link Whitehead’s perception in the mode of causal efficacy with Jung’s collective unconscious—synthesizing Jung’s *depth* with Whitehead’s *pastness*<sup>1</sup>—

---

<sup>1</sup> A similarity first suggested by Catherine Keller, Stanley Hopper, and John Cobb in *The Archetypal Process*.

that we can posit such a relational-imaginal theory of dreaming. To get there, we will examine claims that link causal efficacy and the collective unconscious, functionally compare Whitehead's propositions and propositional feelings with archetypal images and their shared emotional content, and examine how Whitehead's views of symbol and perception open up his framework to include dream images.<sup>2</sup>

### **Causal Efficacy and the Collective Unconscious**

Whereas modern humans see themselves as masters of the world with free rein to objectify and overuse all within it as "resources," for the millennia before this attitude emerged, "the primal cosmos was universally experienced...as tangibly and self-evidently alive and awake—pervasively intentional and responsive, informed by ubiquitous spiritual presences, animated throughout by archetypal forces and intelligible meanings—in a manner that the modern perception does not and perhaps cannot recognize."<sup>3</sup> With the Enlightenment came bifurcation, yet, Keller notes, "Only a self forged in the image of an impenetrable inner hardness, mistaken for integrity, could separate itself from the matrix of all life."<sup>4</sup> Moreover, this Enlightenment legacy continues to fail in its doctrinal refusal to accept nonsensory perception as real. As was discussed in Chapter 3, one of the groundbreaking claims in Whitehead's philosophy is his demonstration that there must be another mode of perception besides sensory perception, what he called *presentational immediacy*. Unless there is some real relationship—*internal relations*—between knower and known how can we claim to truly *know* anything at all? His doctrine of prehensions shows how internal relations between knower and known are truly

---

<sup>2</sup> As mentioned in the Introduction, earlier versions of this work will appear in the forthcoming *Rethinking Whitehead's Symbolism: Thought, Language, Culture*, to be published in 2017 by Edinburgh University Press.

<sup>3</sup> Richard Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche: Intimations of a New World View* (New York: Viking Adult, 2006), 19.

<sup>4</sup> Catherine E. Keller, *The Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming* (London, New York: Routledge, 2003), 94.

possible in an event-based metaphysics. This is particularly important regarding knowledge and memory, for as Whitehead writes,

Either there is something about the immediate occasion which affords knowledge of the past and the future, or we are reduced to utter skepticism as to memory and induction: as to memory, for unless the past is retained in some real way in the present, memory is reduced to a species of fantasy; as to induction, for unless the future is in some sense prefigured in the past and present, predictive statements are entirely arbitrary. Unless an occasion embodies in its present both its past history and its future possibilities, all that can be said of it is where it is—its instantaneous configuration.<sup>5</sup>

The *sensa* we perceive *carry no information* for their own interpretation, but “stand starkly, barely, present, and immediate.” On the other hand, the interpretations of that which we perceive are drawn “from the vast background and foreground of non-sensuous perception with which sense perception is fused, and without which it can never be.” This background is what Whitehead called “pastness,” and it reflects the relationships between events.<sup>6</sup> It is in large part made up of our perception of both “our antecedent bodily states” and our “past presiding ‘ego’ occasions” or the “knowledge of our own immediate past.” In fact, the memory of our immediate past Whitehead considered to be “the most compelling example of non-sensuous perception.”<sup>7</sup> For Whitehead, our bodies are part of nature, and “on equal terms with everything else we experience in nature”<sup>8</sup>; what is perceived through causal efficacy is “vague, haunting, and unmanageable,” “the dark fringes of the present,” and described by Whitehead as a “heavy, primitive experience.” As Keller notes,

Hard as it is to imagine a Victorian gentleman like Whitehead ever having *had* such an experience, his doctrine here embodies an epistemological revolution...His entire cosmological case rests upon the appeal to a phase of

---

<sup>5</sup> Elizabeth M. Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience: A Companion to Whitehead's Process and Reality* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1979), 17.

<sup>6</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead's Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 5.

<sup>7</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 52.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

experience of which we are not or only barely conscious, but which is presupposed by all conscious phases of experience.<sup>9</sup>

Jungian thought, too, understands that humans have a “field of experience larger than that of sense experience,”<sup>10</sup> and that “sense perceptions are first processed somewhere inside us.”<sup>11</sup> Jung explains this as a process wherein sensory activities such as seeing or hearing “create images of themselves, which, when related to the ego, produce a consciousness of the activity in question”; in fact, he defines the ego itself “as an image or reflection of all the activities comprehended by it.”<sup>12</sup> The images that arise from the body are “full of meaning and purpose” and are a “‘picturing’ of vital activities”; such activities are what Jung refers to as the “living being.”<sup>13</sup> For him, the “unconscious contents” of experience are “experienced subjectively and inwardly, but they often [come] into the psyche from outside of itself.”<sup>14</sup> The collective unconscious is considered to be “suprapersonal” and “open to the sense of historical continuity.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore, writes Jung, “What we know of the world, and what we are immediately aware of in ourselves, are conscious contents that flow from remote, obscure [unconscious] sources.”<sup>16</sup>

Whereas Freud based human thought entirely in language and linked dream images to the “primary process of sexual repression,” Jung was a “theorist of the image” for whom “the unconscious image was primary<sup>17</sup> and intrinsically part of what he called the “subtle body”—“the body as psychically conceived or imaged.” Jung theorized the existence of a subtle body

---

<sup>9</sup> Keller, “Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection,” 138–39.

<sup>10</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 41.

<sup>11</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 153.

<sup>12</sup> C. G. Jung, *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Corrected, vol. 8, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series (New York: Pantheon Books, 1969), 325.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 8:326.

<sup>14</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 104.

<sup>15</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 67.

<sup>16</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1969, 8:327.

<sup>17</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 7.

because our body appears in dreams and has therefore been “psychically processed” while contributing directly to our sense of personal identity.” This is not an isolated body: as Rowland details, it “is connected to social pressures” and is at least partly culturally constructed.”<sup>18</sup>

Whitehead, too, did not consider the body an isolated or closed system but considered it

that portion of nature with which each moment of human experience intimately cooperates. There is an inflow and outflow of factors between the bodily actuality and the human experience, so that each shares in the existence of the other. The human body provides our closest experience of the interplay of actualities in nature....the body is part of nature. Thus we finally construe the world in terms of the type of activities disclosed in our intimate experience.<sup>19</sup>

When weprehend or *absorb*<sup>20</sup> God and the world through causal efficacy, we are *feeling* or grasping them objectively along with their *subjective form* or *affective tone*.<sup>21</sup> Lee notes the psychic model as “operative” because “we use feelings in both a sense meaning and an emotional meaning.”<sup>22</sup> In fact, the subject *emerges* as a response to its predecessors and to God, and so is said to be constituted by its relationships.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Jung saw the unconscious as an “objective reality” that “[exerts] specific pressures on our subjective consciousness, and so [produces] compensating viewpoints and directions of development.”<sup>24</sup> Whereas Freud saw the unconscious as being built up by an individual’s repression, Jung recognized that there was more coming from the unconscious than “repressed products of consciousness.”<sup>25</sup> As Argyle reminds us, materials that arise from the unconscious “may be more intelligent, carry a sacred authority, seem to come from outside the person, and possess emotional force.”<sup>26</sup> The unconscious “speaks

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>19</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 43; Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 119.

<sup>20</sup> Ballard, “Kant and Whitehead,” 15.

<sup>21</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 176–77.

<sup>22</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 69.

<sup>23</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 72.

<sup>24</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 97.

<sup>25</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 143.

<sup>26</sup> Michael Argyle, *Psychology and Religion: An Introduction* (London, New York: Routledge, 2000), 105.

to us as a Word of God...confronts us spontaneously,” comes to us from “elsewhere,” and “places obligations upon us.”<sup>27</sup> It is the encounter with “original mystery, with God, with the primary event,” writes the Ulanovs, “that not only gives us being but re-creates us throughout our lives...the primordial experience that binds us to itself...”<sup>28</sup> This “other” in the unconscious is important: Rowland agrees with E. C. Whitmont that we must counter the damaging effects of “masculine monotheism” and its “patriarchal, atheistic, planet-exploiting attitudes” by “returning the goddess” or at least some form of divine immanence that we can experience as “other.”<sup>29</sup> Keller seems to agree.

If the other enters my experience, then it enters as an influence upon me: it makes a difference, and so I am no longer quite the same. But influence, to be more precise, is not working upon me so as much as into me; in-fluence is, that which flows in. If the other flows into the self, then the other is immanent to the self, to the inside being of that self. This is the philosophical meaning of internal rather than external relations: relations between different subjects that are internal to what those subjects are—part of their very essence, for good or for ill.<sup>30</sup>

As with Whitehead’s perception in the mode of causal efficacy, in Jung’s system, what is unconscious is primordial, and the collective unconscious “operates constantly in the background” of consciousness while not determining consciousness “in a fixed way.”<sup>31</sup> Both Cobb and Hopper note the correlation between “the depth of the Jungian psyche” and “the whole of Whitehead’s ‘actual world.’” Noting the fruitfulness of such a correlation, Cobb writes,

...I want to develop the idea that what is imaged as *depth* in Jung and Hillman is what is imaged as *past* in Whitehead. Both traditions could be enriched if Whiteheadians realized more fully that the past is the depth of each occasion of experience, and if Jungians realized that the depth of the psyche is the whole of what Whitehead calls its ‘actual world.’ If we all moved freely back and forth

---

<sup>27</sup> Slusser, “Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth,” 87.

<sup>28</sup> Ulanov and Ulanov, *Religion and the Unconscious*, 15.

<sup>29</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 65–66.

<sup>30</sup> Catherine E. Keller, “Self and God: Separation, Sexism, and Self,” in *Creating Womens Theology: A Movement Engaging Process Thought*, ed. Monica A. Coleman, Nancy R. Howell, and Helene Tallon Russell (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011), 92.

<sup>31</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 97.



between images of depth and images of the temporal past, the power of our imagination would be enhanced.<sup>32</sup>

As well, Griffin connects “Whitehead’s philosophical position about nonsensory perception of the past”<sup>33</sup> (*causal efficacy*) with Jung’s collective unconscious, a link also made by Keller who locates Whitehead’s notion of soul “in the locale of causal efficacy” and connects soul to world “*via* the unconscious.”<sup>34</sup> Jung places the human psyche solidly within nature *and* dissolves the “soul-world boundary” when he asserts that “psyche and matter exist in one and the same world, and each partakes of the other”; for Keller, that “one and the same world” is the “causal underworld where psyche and matter conspire in the dark—in the place before consciousness” where there is “interconnexity.”<sup>35</sup> There is a compelling linkage between Hillman’s view of dream work as “feeding soul each night with new material” and Keller’s view of causal efficacy as the soul-making “underworld of actuality.” Describing causal efficacy as “the past energetically decomposing as the very ground of the present’s composition,” Keller links that directly to dreams which then “constitute an instance of such a rhythm of decomposing and recomposing, an instance in which the mode of presentational immediacy is vastly subordinated in importance to that of causal efficacy.”<sup>36</sup> Clearly, Jung would have welcomed Whitehead’s ideas on causal efficacy, for, as Craig Chalquist writes, “Jung destroyed our solipsism. Something unknown, the extra-human, approaches us through symbols, through psyche. We turn inward and find the world awaiting our most genuine and heartfelt response.”<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Cobb Jr., “Eternal Objects and Archetypes: A Response to Stanley Hopper,” 127.

<sup>33</sup> Griffin, “Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements,” 14.

<sup>34</sup> Keller, “Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection,” 139.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 144–46.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 139–40.

<sup>37</sup> Craig Chalquist, “Who Was Carl Jung and Why Should We Study Him and His Work?,” accessed November 25, 2016, <http://www.pacificapost.com/who-was-carl-jung-and-why-should-we-study-him-and-his-work>.

## Proposition, Image, and Emotion

What is perceived through causal efficacy—our inner and outer actual worlds—is “heavy with emotion”<sup>38</sup> and is described by Griffin as “the transference of value” and “transitions of emotion.”<sup>39</sup> Kraus describes such perception as an “emotionally-charged feeling of the presence and pressure of the bodily and external environments.”<sup>40</sup> Similarly, Kelsey writes that what arises from the unconscious in the form of images during non-directed or intuitive thinking conveys “emotional meaning.”<sup>41</sup> While what is perceived via the senses is barren, what is prehended or inherited through causal efficacy carries “vector feeling-tone” that displays “evidence of its origin.”<sup>42</sup> *Subjectively*, aesthetics is about feeling while *objectively*, aesthetics is “essentially a patterning or ordering which harmonizes contrasts.”<sup>43</sup> Feeling tone unites “objectivity and subjectivity in a pattern of contrasts”<sup>44</sup> and the combination of pattern, contrast, image, and emotion form the aesthetic experience at the “foundations of the world” that are the result of the “immanence of God.”<sup>45</sup> For Jung, this “immanence of God” is evident in his “radical personification” of the psyche. As Heisig describes it,

Instead of thinking of mental events as hidden motives, instinctual drives, dim memories, traumatic events, and the like, Jung imagined them as persons. He imagined the complexes of the psyche as the players who people our dreams and fantasies; in myth, symbols, and rites handed down from tradition he saw not preconceptual *Urdummheit* [primeval stupidity] but the projection of depth of feeling that pervades all representation on whatever level of sophistication it

---

<sup>38</sup> Alan Brinkley B., “Whitehead on Symbolic Reference,” in *Studies in Whitehead’s Philosophy*, vol. 10, Tulane Studies in Philosophy (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1961), 44.

<sup>39</sup> David Ray Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Lock Our Ailing World,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 241–42.

<sup>40</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 75.

<sup>41</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 110.

<sup>42</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 112.

<sup>43</sup> W. Norman Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love: Human Experience and Christian Faith in a Process Perspective* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1979), 28.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

<sup>45</sup> Stanley R. Hopper, “Once More: The Cavern beneath the Cave,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 111.

occurs. And the whole process, for Jung, was not the outcome of deliberate attempts of gifted persons to allegorize for the sake of rhetorical or emotional impact, but the work of a habitual, instinctual, ineluctable demand of the psyche to transform all of life into the image of persons so that it might have ‘real’ meaning for us...Personifying...protects the soul that mediates my way to the world by letting it do what it does, and what it has always done: imaging the world as the playground of daemonic forces which give vitality to the givenness of experience...<sup>46</sup>

Perceptions through causal efficacy are designed to *move* us, and this is even more evident when we examine Whitehead’s theory of propositions, hybrid feelings that arise in the latter phases of concrescence for more complex entities.

In Whitehead’s philosophy God is “the lure for feeling, the eternal urge of desire.”<sup>47</sup> This urge is an aim at *contrast*<sup>48</sup> and this can be seen as resonant with the way in which the unconscious psyche seeks to compensate an out-of-balance ego attitude through contrasting archetypal imagery. As mentioned earlier, this is related to relevance, for “relevance is the mechanism for the achievement of aesthetic contrast in a series of events...each entity strives to achieve the maximum internal contrast of which it is capable.”<sup>49</sup> Similarly, Young-Eisendrath and Hall note that “For Jung, the emotionally-infused image is the primary organizer or most fundamentally coherent unit of the human psyche. Whereas Piaget emphasizes the repetitive interactions of the infant’s body with the environment, Jung highlights the power of emotion to evoke meaningful constellations or symbolic representations at all stages of development.”<sup>50</sup> Like the relationship between archetypal images and archetypes, propositions “mix the potentiality of eternal objects with the limiting conditions of actual entities and thus introduce a new kind of

---

<sup>46</sup> James W. Heisig, “The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 192–93.

<sup>47</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 344.

<sup>48</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 97.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, 142.

<sup>50</sup> Polly Young-Eisendrath and James Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology: A Constructivist Perspective* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1991), 2.

datum for feeling...a proposition,” writes Hosinski, “thus represents a possibility related to a concrete situation in the actual world.”<sup>51</sup> A propositional feeling is the subjective form of the proposition, as well as the entity’s subjective, evaluative, and *felt* response to it.

Jung understood the archetypes as pressing “for their own resolution”<sup>52</sup> and as “complexes of experience that come upon us like fate”<sup>53</sup> with a fascinating “dynamism”<sup>54</sup> and “compelling force.”<sup>55</sup> Kraus hints at the same urgency when she insists that we should not understand eternal objects as “inert forms waiting to be appropriated”; rather, they are “dynamic” and “have the unrest of the Platonic Eros.”<sup>56</sup> Robertson also links archetypes to feeling, not just as emotion but as *valuation*, noting that archetypes have “feeling connections to things in the world” and are evaluative not based on “what” something is but in “how it fits into things.”<sup>57</sup> Such valuation is an *aesthetic* valuation. Moreover, Hosinski writes that a proposition’s “primary function” is to “lure our action and this is accomplished by attracting us through value.”<sup>58</sup> Similarly, Odin refers to the pattern of eternal objects received as the immanence of God in every occasion as an “aesthetic value-pattern” that “establishes the primacy of aesthetic experience in Whitehead’s axiological metaphysics.”<sup>59</sup>

The sense that archetypal images or symbols evoke “feeling” or “numinosity” is functionally related to what Whitehead calls “subjective form,” and it is subjective form that carries emotion, value, and purpose.<sup>60</sup> When subjectsprehend eternal objects conceptually, the

---

<sup>51</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 106–7.

<sup>52</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 193.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 391.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 103–4.

<sup>55</sup> Frey-Rohn, *From Freud to Jung*, 97.

<sup>56</sup> Kraus, *The Metaphysics of Experience*, 47.

<sup>57</sup> Personal phone conversation with Robin Robertson held in the Fall of 2015.

<sup>58</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 102.

<sup>59</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 167.

<sup>60</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 33, 70.

“how” of that prehension—the subjective form—is an aesthetic reaction to the “worth or value” of the object. It is felt first as “belonging to the other” entity from which it is being prehended, then “felt as possible for me”; finally, the subject’s “appetition” is its desire for personal satisfaction in forming that subjective experience.<sup>61</sup> When a feeling has the “datum” of an eternal object, it is known as a “conceptual feeling” and it is then a determinant of the character of the concurring entity.<sup>62</sup> Whitehead considered feeling to be

an essential doctrine in the philosophy of organism” because “the primary function of a proposition is to be relevant as a lure for feeling... The ‘subjective aim,’ which controls the becoming of a subject, is that subject feeling a proposition with the subjective form of purpose to realize it in that process of self-creation.”<sup>63</sup>

Similarly, we can say that the “datum” of the archetype or eternal object is perceived first as an “image” or “proposition” that carries “emotion” or “subjective form” and is therefore “persuasive” or “numinous.” Like hybrid propositions joining the conceptual with feeling, archetypal images carry “living intensity,” notes Walter Shelburne. “‘They are as much feelings as thoughts;...’ This characteristic quality of the symbol to evoke emotion is termed its ‘numinosity,’ the numen being the specific energy of the archetypes.”<sup>64</sup> They can have a “mystical aura” that has a “corresponding effect upon the emotions.”<sup>65</sup> Archetypes are dipolar in that they have both an “instinctive body-based pole as well as a spiritual one”<sup>66</sup>; similarly, Kelsey describes them as being both images of “pure instinctual drives” and as containing “spiritual reality.”<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 86–87.

<sup>62</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 240.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.*, 250.

<sup>64</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 43–44.

<sup>65</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 96.

<sup>66</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 20.

<sup>67</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 113.

Mattingly likens the conceptual prehension of eternal objects to “imagination”<sup>68</sup>; functioning in the mental pole, it could be said that just as the eternal object determines and mediates the datum, the archetype determines and mediates the image. At this stage, what is being described is still objective and unconscious, and is therefore in a state of “transcendent decision,” or is purely conceptual. This datum or image—whose “relevance” could also be described as an appropriateness for one’s personal unconscious and complexes—then “provokes the origination” of prehension, or the entry into one’s personal psyche, where it becomes an “immanent decision.”<sup>69</sup> As an “immanent decision,” there is subjective form, affective tone, and the encounter with one’s “feeling-toned complexes.”<sup>70</sup> At this stage, the activity is now an “impure prehension” of an objective datum, image, or symbol that the concreting actuality appropriates for itself.<sup>71</sup> Functioning in the physical pole, archetypal images may be prehended in various types of past occasions, including the dream images generated as signals by the “complex amplifier” of the human body,<sup>72</sup> from historical occasions in the actual world (the “massive presence of the past”<sup>73</sup>), and from God’s consequent nature. Archetypal images continue to come into play during the integration phase of concrescence as propositional feelings that may be raised to conscious decision. The importance of this will be covered in Chapter 8.

### Symbol and Perception

In his forward to Juan Eduardo Cirlot’s text entitled *A Dictionary of Symbols*, Herbert Read writes that every human “is a symbolizing animal; it is evident that at no stage in the

---

<sup>68</sup> Mattingly, “Whitehead’s Theory of Eternal Objects,” 94.

<sup>69</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 164.

<sup>70</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 76–77.

<sup>71</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 164.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>73</sup> Sherburne, *A Key to Whitehead’s Process and Reality*, 173.

development of civilization has man been able to dispense with symbols.”<sup>74</sup> Although Whitehead sees symbolism as “essential for the higher grades of life,” he conversely states that humans are both attracted to and repulsed by symbols because “hard-headed men want facts and not symbols.”<sup>75</sup> Because Whitehead saw symbols as uncontrollable, like “wild vegetation” that could “overwhelm” humanity, he believed that the advance of civilization required that humans reject the superstitious symbols of their “savage past.”<sup>76</sup> Yet Whitehead acquiesces to the truth that despite all efforts to “expel” it, symbolism—like Nature—will “ever return” and is “inherent in the very texture of human life.” He continues, “Mankind, it seems, has to find a symbol in order to express itself. Indeed ‘expression’ is ‘symbolism.’”<sup>77</sup>

Whitehead writes that “the human mind is functioning symbolically when some components of its experience elicit consciousness, beliefs, emotions, and usages, respecting other components of its experience. The former set of components are the ‘symbols,’ and the latter set constitute the ‘meaning’ of the symbols.”<sup>78</sup> Jung agreed that symbols are powerful. He drew a distinction between symbols and signs, defining signs as “representations of known things” (for example, in the way that a company’s trademark represents the company itself). A symbol, on the other hand, is not the “logical equivalent” of that to which it refers, but “points beyond itself to an unknown.” In a symbol, the “known and unknown,” or the “real and unreal,” are joined: “If it were only real,” writes Jung, “it would not be a symbol, for it would then be a real phenomenon and hence unsymbolic...And if it were altogether unreal, it would be mere empty imagining, which, being related to nothing real, would not be a symbol either.”<sup>79</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> Juan Eduardo Cirlot, *A Dictionary of Symbols* (Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2002), x.

<sup>75</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 183; Alfred North Whitehead, *Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect*, Revised (New York: Fordham University Press, 1985), 60.

<sup>76</sup> Whitehead, *Symbolism*, 60.

<sup>77</sup> *Ibid.*, 61–62.

<sup>78</sup> *Ibid.*, 7–8.

<sup>79</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 43.

Discussion of Whitehead's symbolism and symbolic reference seems typically to be limited to sense perception and the use and interpretation of language as symbolic, but Whitehead's position on the two modes of perception insists that should we find "instances of non-sensuous perception, then the tacit identification of perception with sense-perception must be a fatal error barring the advance of systematic metaphysics."<sup>80</sup> For this project, therefore, there is no convincing argument that requires us to limit our discussion of symbolism to human language; in fact, since dream symbols are first perceived non-sensuously (directly through the body while conscious functioning in the dreamer's brain is less active), we would be committing that "fatal error" should we dismiss them from Whiteheadian scholarship.

But how can we connect the dots between Whitehead's "symbol" and Jung's archetypal images that carry such numinosity and feeling that they appear in dreams and myth, and serve as transformers of psychic energy? Whitehead himself cracks open the door that allows us to connect his ideas on symbolism to the imaginal realm of art, dream symbols, and archetypes. In both *Adventures of Ideas* and *Symbolism*, Whitehead extends his definition of symbol to include such instances of creative expression as art, music, play, and poetic literature as well as to the symbols of religious ritual, including ceremonial clothing, smells, and visual appearances. In discussing Appearance and Reality, he writes that music introduces "an emotional clothing which changes the dim objective reality into a clear Appearance matching the subjective form provided for its prehension." Art is said to "spring" from both physical and "purely imaginative" origins and to be a "sublimation" of the "simple craving to enjoy freely the vividness of life"; it has a "curative function" and reveals "intimate, absolute Truth regarding the Nature of Things."<sup>81</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 180.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*, 249.



Dreams and their symbols, according to Jung, are both a source of information and a “means of self-regulation” (due to the self-balancing nature of the psyche), reveal “hidden factors of [the dreamer’s] personality,” and are “our most effective aids in the task of building up the personality.” Yet even he was somewhat perplexed by the exact nature of the dream.<sup>82</sup> Whitehead might very well agree that symbols are both informative and difficult to grasp, as he writes that “The object of symbolism is the enhancement of the importance of what is symbolized. In a discussion of instances of symbolism, our first difficulty is to discover exactly what is being symbolized. The symbols are specific enough, but it is often extremely difficult to analyse what lies beyond them...”<sup>83</sup> He describes symbols as having “unhandy meanings that are often vague” or “indefinite,” but acknowledges as well that “it is easier to smell incense than to produce certain religious emotions. Indeed, for many purposes, certain aesthetic experiences which are easy to produce make better symbols than do words, written or spoken.”<sup>84</sup>

Symbols, in Jung’s system, are a way of representing archetypally the material that is unconscious. Though he acknowledged that dreams may sometimes “reflect ego trivialities,” especially powerful dream images are more numinous because they “[signify] the activity of a collective archetype.” Rowland writes,

Symbols as archetypal images refer to the ungraspable world of unconscious creativity. They must be read as pointing to the unknowable and therefore to the un-theorizable. Symbols also point forwards, to a person’s future development in growing intimacies with unconscious forces, not back to the archeology of the Oedipal child. Equally, a Jungian symbol may be so powerful in impact that it carries a sense of the sacred.<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 62.

<sup>83</sup> Whitehead, *Symbolism*, 62–63.

<sup>84</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 183.

<sup>85</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 37.

Dream symbols, like linguistic symbols, can be considered a type of “symbolic truth,” wherein Whitehead’s *Appearance* of the images and the *Reality* of the dreamer are linked. Though there is nothing about a dream image that is directly or causally explicative of the dreamer’s reality, upon analysis, a dreamer may find the two to be meaningfully related. Of symbolic truths, Whitehead writes, “In their own natures the Appearances throw no light upon the Realities, nor do the Realities upon the Appearances, except in the experiences of a set of peculiarly conditioned percipients.”<sup>86</sup> The dreamer, then, is the “peculiarly conditioned percipient” whose life experiences and inner psychic reality have conditioned his or her perception and interpretation of dream images.

For both Whitehead and Jung—as in Paul Tillich’s theology—it seems the reason a symbol can function as a symbol is because it is both an element of our psyche or consciousness, and yet at the same time “participates in the reality to which it gives access.”<sup>87</sup> This *participation* is what Whitehead termed *symbolic reference*.

[T]here is ‘symbolic reference’ between the two species when the perception of a member of one species evokes its correlate in the other species, and precipitates upon this correlate the fusion of feelings, emotions, and derivate actions, which belong to either of the pair of correlates, and which are also enhanced by this correlation. The species from which the symbolic reference starts is called the ‘species of symbols,’ and the species with which it ends is called the ‘species of meanings.’<sup>88</sup>

The “common ground” experienced in such symbolic reference is not limited only to earth-bound actual entities. Whitehead understood God’s relationship to the world as one of mutual immanence, and writes that “It is as true to say that the World is immanent in God, as that God is immanent in the World.”<sup>89</sup> In a way that is similarly evocative, Tillich describes the relationship

---

<sup>86</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 248.

<sup>87</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 35.

<sup>88</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 181.

<sup>89</sup> *Ibid.*, 348.

between God and humans in this way: “In the human spirit’s essential relation to the divine Spirit, there is no correlation, but, rather, mutual immanence...If God were not also in [humans] so that [humans] could ask for God, God’s speaking to [humans] could not be perceived by [humans].”<sup>90</sup> In Whitehead’s system, God is immanent in every occasion as its initial subjective aim, in the ordered relevance of possibilities offered as eternal objects, and as God’s superjective consequent nature.

Though we might say that archetypal dream images are initially perceived through the mode of causal efficacy from the body, in a practice of dream work, they are recorded and analyzed, and therefore are then re-perceived through the mode of presentational immediacy. Such dream images brought to conscious awareness are then raised from unconscious propositional feelings to conscious intellectual feelings, where they participate in symbolic reference. Such symbols and images are the linchpin between Whitehead’s modes of perception (causal efficacy and presentational immediacy) because they are both present in the psyche and participate in that toward which they point. Clearly, both Whitehead and Jung connect the “spheres of matter and psyche” through the objective function of the primordial realm of eternal objects and archetypes, as well as in the consequent realm of past fact, propositions, and numinous, historically-conditioned imaginal symbols.

We can therefore directly place dreams and dream work squarely within a Whiteheadian frame for several reasons, including: (1) since Whitehead included imaginal expression in his understanding of symbolism, and was open to including non-sensory perception, we can connect Whitehead’s symbolism and that of Jung; (2) that functional resonances exist between Whiteheadian and Jungian schools of thought in multiple areas, including the existence of a

---

<sup>90</sup> Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology, Volume III* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976), 114, 127.

transpersonal realm of formal causation, a dipolar God or collective unconscious, that feeling and value are integral to human experience, and that raising unconscious material to consciousness is essential for human flourishing; and (3) that an integration of Whiteheadian and Jungian thought—especially when combined with a spiritual practice of dream work—can positively influence human society’s intensity of experience and our overall aliveness, vitality, and zest for life.

### **Construction: A Relational-Imaginal Theory of Dreaming**

It is in dreams that one can catch sight of the most fundamental and stable symbolisms of humanity passing from the “cosmic” function to the “psychic function.”

—Paul Ricoeur, *The Symbolism of Evil*

This is how he dreams. He takes materials from the entire world and, taking them apart on his own and then on his own putting them back together, he dreams with his own radiance, with his own light. In that place this person becomes his own light.

—*Brihadaranyaka Upanishad*

Holding to Whitehead’s “one world” philosophy, this project rejects the possibility that dreams and dream content are somehow “delivered” into a sleeping person through supernatural agents—what Hobson dismisses as “secret, coded messages” that “require elaborate interpretations by special authorities.”<sup>91</sup> But is it essential to understand the divine nature of dreams as *supernatural*? Not for Jung. Though Jung identified many different archetypes within the psyche—the shadow, anima, animus, etc.—the archetypal Self is the God-image of wholeness in the psyche; it has the power to unify the personality and integrate its opposites. It

---

<sup>91</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 58.

does this through the process of individuation, a process that is reliant on a dialogue between the conscious and unconscious mind through the common language of symbol and image. These “image-symbols of the unconscious,” Johnson writes, “find their way to the level of consciousness mainly by two routes: dreams and imagination,”<sup>92</sup> and these two have something crucial in common: “their power to convert the invisible forms of the unconscious into images that are perceptible to the conscious mind.” As noted earlier, Jung did not share Freud’s belief that dreams were inherently deceptive, but saw them as “a part of nature, which harbors no intention to deceive, and expresses something as best it can, just as a plant grows or an animal seeks food as best it can.”<sup>93</sup> As Singer describes it

The unconscious, through dreams and through its manifestations in everyday life, provides all the information we need to know. The unconscious, with its ingenious way of symbolizing, sets the picture before us: this is how it is, there are these and these obstacles, but there is a chance of breaking through to a new position with a wider perspective. Or the unconscious may place violent objections in the path, warning of disaster if the stirring up of archetypal material is encouraged to continue.<sup>94</sup>

Researchers in the psychological and cognitive sciences like Hobson and Hartmann seem content to restrict dreaming (and in Hartmann’s case all related “default mode” activity like reverie, fantasy, and daydreaming) to a mental function generated solely by brain activity.<sup>95</sup> On the other hand, in our discussions of the body and the dreaming brain, we must keep in mind that to equate brain with mind is to make an unwarranted leap. Richard Kradin, a medical internist and Jungian analyst, notes that Western medicine is both Aristotelian in its reliance on what is empirical and sensate and Newtonian in that it “approaches the body through a lens of linear

---

<sup>92</sup> Johnson, *Inner Work*, 20.

<sup>93</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 30.

<sup>94</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 151.

<sup>95</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 58; Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 31, 62.

determinism with reductionistic goals.”<sup>96</sup> He faults medicine for failing to “recognize both the complexity and non-linearity of human physiology, and, in particular, that of the nervous system” where he argues that drawing from “non-linear or deterministically chaotic systems” that are “exquisitely sensitive to initial conditions” is better suited. He continues,

Few scientists would disagree that mind depends on the activities of the nervous system. But as an emergent phenomenon, it cannot be reduced to the materiality of the nervous system...mind is not brain; the two are qualitatively different, just as water does not share properties with the constituent elements of hydrogen and oxygen...neuroscience, as currently configured, can teach us little concerning the phenomenology of mind.<sup>97</sup>

Prior to Freud, scientists saw dreams as “strictly a somatic process,”<sup>98</sup> but Freud and Jung agreed that dreaming was more than sleep-time bodily sensations or the day’s meal, although such mundane activities “furnish the elements upon which the psychological processes do their work.” For Jung, dreams “imaged” the dreamer’s “unconscious psychic situation.”<sup>99</sup> He felt strongly that

It is really high time academic psychologists came down to earth and wanted to hear about the human psyche as it really is and not merely about laboratory experiments. It is insufferable that professors should forbid their students to have anything to do with analytical psychology, that they should prohibit the use of analytical concepts and accuse our psychology of taking account, in an unscientific manner, of ‘everyday experiences.’ I know that psychology in general could derive the greatest benefit from a serious study of the dream problem once it could rid itself of the unjustified lay prejudice that dreams are caused solely by somatic stimuli.<sup>100</sup>

Yet we must remember that what Jung called “psychic process” is a “phenomenon dependent on the nervous system” of the *body* in which unconscious contents are made conscious through “representation” via images, and these images are “reflections of processes in the brain.”<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup> Kradin, “Reply to Bessel van Der Kolk,” 189–90.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 190–91.

<sup>98</sup> Sigmund Freud, *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*, trans. A. A. Brill (New York: Modern Library, 1995), 185.

<sup>99</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 244, 246.

<sup>100</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1969, 8:529.

<sup>101</sup> Ibid., 8:322.

Hillman, Griffin notes, “has been reluctant to root images (sensory and otherwise) in some more basic *feeling*, because that could imply that images were derivative representations of inherently imageless feelings which would lead us back to solipsistic subjectivism.”<sup>102</sup> Hobson even goes so far as to claim that the brain *creates* any meaning associated with dreams out of value-free data and “random neural activities of the brain.”<sup>103</sup> But this again is the beauty of integrating Whitehead’s notion of causal efficacy: the “basic feeling” is a *prehension* of the world and God, not just of the dreamer’s internal systems, and certainly not merely something generated by the brain.

### *Emotion*

Between the years of 1913-17, after having split with Freud, Jung conducted what we might call a “deep dive” into the unconscious and what impressed him most was the “power of [its] images.” Robertson notes that “During the worst of his inner battles, [Jung] discovered that whenever he could take the emotions that buffeted him and translate them into images, he felt calmer.” Could it be that dreams are the body-mind’s way of processing the aesthetic-emotional information being received through perceptive experiences and turning that data into images so that the information can be raised to consciousness and used by the dreaming individual in her planning and decision-making?

The strong emotions present in dreams, according to Bulkeley, indicate the involvement of the “ancient sub-neocortical limbic brain regions we share with other mammals. This research supports the basic idea that our brains have a deeply programmed ability to generate a variety of

---

<sup>102</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 244.

<sup>103</sup> Bulkeley, *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*, 58–61.

emotions, both negative and positive, in both waking and dreaming experience.”<sup>104</sup> Yet is there proof that the brain *generates* any emotion at all? Here we benefit from the work of Daugherty who refuses to equate brain with mind and describes the difference between *reductionist* and *reflective* views of the brain. While the reductionist view assumes that any brain activity associated with experience means that the brain is *generating* the experience, the reflective view only goes so far as to assert that the experience is *reflected* in the brain.

The mind thinks, the brain reflects that thought. The brain may reflect the soul, but it is not the soul itself. There are some scientists that will have you believe if you have an experience of God, and it is reflected in your brain, it is really only a malfunction of your brain. Therefore they ‘reduce’ the experience to the workings of the brain itself. However, a good counter-example is the experience of sex. If I have a sex spot in my brain that is activated during sexual activity, it does not mean I am not having a sexual event. It merely means it is reflecting a sexual thought or experience I may be engaged in at the moment.<sup>105</sup>

Similarly, Jeffrey Kripal, a professor of philosophy and religious thought at Rice University, suggests that “your brain might be a radio,” arguing that dominant “flatland models” that “shrink” human nature ignore clues over centuries of thought that suggest that in times of apparent precognitive or religious experience,

the human brain may function as a super-evolved neurological radio or television and, in rare but revealing moments [often those associated with strong emotion and demonstrated in precognitive dreams] when the channel suddenly ‘switches,’ as an imperfect receiver of some transhuman signal that simply does not play by the rules as we know them.<sup>106</sup>

Studies in lucid dreaming performed by Keith Hearne and Stephen LaBerge produced “convincing scientific evidence...to support the reality of self-awareness in sleep...a state that [by definition] lacks consciousness” because the regions of the brain normally associated with

---

<sup>104</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 202.

<sup>105</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 43.

<sup>106</sup> Jeffrey J. Kripal, “Visions of the Impossible,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 31, 2014, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Embrace-the-Unexplained/145557/>.



consciousness are not active. Does this prove that awareness or consciousness cannot be limited to the brain? Bulkeley writes that “the naturalistic workings of the sleeping brain can generate hyper-realistic visions, deeply creative insights, and extraordinary states of awareness,”<sup>107</sup> but again, can we be sure that those experiences are being *generated* by the brain alone or is the brain *reflecting* what is happening in the entire body-mind organism? Clearly, Daugherty supports the latter view:

As long as we are humanly alive, experience is a completely embodied phenomenon. Any experience we have is registered through, and can be measured in, various systems of our body. Without our bodies we cease to have the human experience...Even the most spiritual or mystical of experiences are registered in, and facilitated through our human bodies.<sup>108</sup>

As was already discussed in Chapter 5, dreams clearly reflect emotional experience. Hartmann describes dreaming as “metaphoric picturing, guided by emotion” and argues that humans “build our memory systems using emotionally based similarity.”<sup>109</sup> As well, the correlation that Kripal makes between precognitive dreams and strong emotion—demonstrated in anecdotal incidences related by the likes of Mark Twain and forensic pathologist Janis Amatuzio—is corroborated by Bulkeley who points to prophetic dreaming as interweaving what he terms our “autonomous visionary capacity” with situations that are “emotionally charged, extremely important, and yet unclear in [their] outcome...Reaching the limits of ordinary conscious thought and reasoning, people look for ways to extend their perceptual abilities farther ahead in time.”<sup>110</sup> There is nothing “magical or supernatural” about this because,

The brain that spends the day engaged in future-oriented thought (planning, preparation, anticipating, scheduling) is also the brain that sleeps at night and remains engaged in many of those same cognitive processes...in sleep the brain has greater powers of neuroplasticity, an extended range of cognitive creativity,

---

<sup>107</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 271.

<sup>108</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 73.

<sup>109</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 53.

<sup>110</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 232.

wider associative networks, less executive control, and looser constraints on what can and cannot be thought.<sup>111</sup>

But if Whitehead is correct that we may perceive “the creativity of the world [as] the throbbing emotion of the past hurling itself into a new transcendent fact,”<sup>112</sup> then we can expand our theories of dreaming from merely a solipsistic translation of internal states into a relational process that reflects information perceived through causal efficacy that is laced with aesthetic value—*feeling the world*—and is internally constitutive of our own objective *and* subjective experience.

### *The Vagus Nerve: Body-Mind-World Communication*

By interweaving Whitehead’s views of causal efficacy as felt mostly through the “withness of the body” and of body as a “starting point for our knowledge of the circumambient world”<sup>113</sup> with Jung’s views of psyche-body-world, we are now able to see humans as fully embodied beings within one world that integrates body and mind, psyche and matter. Moreover, we can know that our dreams too must be rooted in our bodies as systems that are inclusive of mind and internally related to all that we experience and perceive. In an event-based and integrated reality, body and brain are not separate, body and world are not separate, and none are completely closed systems. Is the dreaming body-mind “creating” meaning out of random signals, as Hobson suggests, or is the dreaming body-mind collecting and interpreting perceptual data that is both physical and conceptual and processing that information in a way that can be used for its own flourishing? If the latter is true, and we assume that such perception by body-

---

<sup>111</sup> Ibid., 237.

<sup>112</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 177; Hopper, “Language as Metaphorical: A Reply to John Cobb,” 131.

<sup>113</sup> Brinkley, “Whitehead on Symbolic Reference,” 43.

mind of world (and God) is possible, then what might be the actual means through which that occurs?

Jungian analyst Marion Woodman believes that the *image* is the connector through feeling tone between psyche and soma.

The feeling-tone in the body, where the belly resonates with the resonating heart and liver, all of this is producing chemistry that is picked up by the brain. Science is now working on this grand computer, the brain, transforming feeling into image. The image gives us an understanding of what's happening in the body and some insight into the anguish in the brain and the psyche. I see psyche and soma as one. The metaphorical symbol is the connector. It requires resonating space in which to unfold.<sup>114</sup>

It is here proposed that aesthetic and value-rich information perceived as feeling tone and image by the body-mind, and percepta prehended by the body, are conveyed from the viscera as emotion-heavy “gut feelings” to the brain stem via the vagus nerve’s afferent fibers and its associated neurotransmitters. Once they reach the brain, the feeling-tone and emotion-heavy data activate archetypal images in the form of propositional feelings. Those images may then be processed via the dreaming brain’s default mode activation pattern and its associated functions (as described in Chapter 5) to facilitate adaptive learning and memory-emotion integration. Recent research has documented roles of the vagus nerve that were previously unknown that, while we have neither the space nor the expertise to conclusively prove, may support this theory. A brief description follows.

As the largest of the twelve peripheral nerves that exit the brain stem directly (rather than via the spinal cord), the *vagus* nerve (from the Latin meaning “wandering”) meanders from the brain through the neck and thoracic cavity all the way to the abdomen.<sup>115</sup> According to Liu, et al, the vagus nerve terminates in the brain stem where it connects “directly and indirectly with brain

---

<sup>114</sup> Woodman, “Coming to a Door,” xii.

<sup>115</sup> Miriam van Mersbergen, “Viva La Vagus!,” *Choral Journal* 55, no. 3 (October 2014): 68.

structures including the ...amygdala, hypothalamus, insula, thalamus, orbitofrontal cortex, and other limbic regions responsible for mood and anxiety regulation.”<sup>116</sup> It is part of what is now called the “gut-brain axis” and although it allows for both “top-down (CNS [central nervous system] to viscera) and bottom-up (viscera to CNS)” or “bidirectional” information flow,<sup>117</sup> 80% of its fibers are *afferent* (bottom-up), meaning it is predominantly devoted to communicating visceral information to the brain. It is believed that the vagus nerve “plays an important role in body/brain interactions,”<sup>118</sup> notes Mersbergen. Moreover,

The cell bodies of this nerve are housed in four large areas in the brain stem, creating a hub where nerves from different parts of the body communicate with each other. The proximity of nerve cell bodies in this area allow various parts of the body to communicate complicated information with each other, allowing for sophisticated processing of information.<sup>119</sup>

Using both neuronal routes and endocrine neurotransmitters, the body sends “gut instincts” or “gut feelings”—identified as “somatic signals”—to the brain that “influence decision making and behavioral responses without explicit awareness of the provoking cues” meaning that they are below the level of conscious awareness.<sup>120</sup> The vagus complex has been described as the “substrate for body-mind connections”<sup>121</sup> and a “mind-body feedback loop.”<sup>122</sup> Bergland writes that “Visceral feelings and gut instincts are literally emotional intuitions transferred up to your brain via the vagus nerve.”<sup>123</sup> Via its afferent fibers, the vagus nerve is also understood to be “the

---

<sup>116</sup> Jun Liu et al., “Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation Modulates Amygdala Functional Connectivity in Patients with Depression,” *Journal of Affective Disorders* 205 (November 15, 2016): 322, doi:10.1016/j.jad.2016.08.003.

<sup>117</sup> Melanie Klarer et al., “Gut Vagal Afferents Differentially Modulate Innate Anxiety and Learned Fear,” *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 34, no. 21 (May 21, 2014): 7067, doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0252-14.2014.

<sup>118</sup> Mersbergen, “Viva La Vagus!,” 70.

<sup>119</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>120</sup> Klarer et al., “Gut Vagal Afferents Differentially Modulate Innate Anxiety and Learned Fear,” 7067.

<sup>121</sup> Lisa E. Goehler, “Vagal Complexity: Substrate for Body-Mind Connections?,” *Bratislavske Lekarske Listy* 107, no. 8 (2006): 275.

<sup>122</sup> Bergland, “How Does the Vagus Nerve Convey Gut Instincts to the Brain?”

<sup>123</sup> *Ibid.*

mechanism by which peripheral epinephrine activates the release of brain norepinephrine during memory consolidation.”<sup>124</sup> Adelson explains that

emotional events affect the body to influence how well the brain encodes information about exciting or meaningful events. First, emotionally arousing events stimulate the nervous system to release epinephrine...[which then] activates the ascending fibers of the vagus nerve, which in turn stimulate the brain neurons in an area of the brainstem known as the nucleus of the solitary tract (NTS)...NTS neurons release norepinephrine into brain structures that process memory, such as the amygdala and hippocampus...epinephrine regulates memory consolidation, acting via the vagus nerve.<sup>125</sup>

More and more is being discovered that reveals the vagus complex and its associated neurotransmitters to be involved in numerous aspects of health, including consciousness and self-referential processing,<sup>126</sup> cognition,<sup>127</sup> processing of emotionally arousing events and memory storage,<sup>128</sup> stress reduction, emotional regulation and heart rate variability,<sup>129</sup> social interaction (polyvagal theory),<sup>130</sup> reduction of inflammation, and is related to such serious conditions as anxiety, depression, diabetes and obesity.<sup>131</sup> In an article linking the vagus nerve directly with emotion, heart rate variability (HRV), environment, and health, Thayer and Lane write that

Emotions represent a distillation of an individual’s perception of personally relevant environmental interactions, including not only challenges and threats but also the ability to respond to them. Viewed as such, emotions reflect the status of one’s ongoing adjustment to constantly changing environmental demands. When the affective system works properly, it promotes flexible adaptation to shifting

---

<sup>124</sup> Rachel Adelson, “Stimulating the Vagus Nerve: Memories Are Made of This,” *American Psychological Association*, April 2004, <http://www.apa.org/monitor/apr04/vagus.aspx>.

<sup>125</sup> Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> Jiliang Fang et al., “Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation Modulates Default Mode Network in Major Depressive Disorder,” *Biological Psychiatry* 79, no. 4 (February 15, 2016): 266, doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.03.025.

<sup>127</sup> Goehler, “Vagal Complexity,” 275.

<sup>128</sup> Adelson, “Stimulating the Vagus Nerve.”

<sup>129</sup> Julian F. Thayer and Richard D. Lane, “Claude Bernard and the Heart–brain Connection: Further Elaboration of a Model of Neurovisceral Integration,” *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, The Inevitable Link between Heart and Behavior: New Insights from Biomedical Research and Implications for Clinical Practice, 33, no. 2 (February 2009): 82, doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.08.004.

<sup>130</sup> Mersbergen, “Viva La Vagus!,” 72.

<sup>131</sup> Ibid.

environmental demands...The relationship between HRV and emotional regulation will have important implications for those that study the link between emotional states and dispositions such as depression, anxiety, anger, and hostility, alexithymia, and physical health.<sup>132</sup>

Interestingly, As Mersbergen concludes, the vagus nerve is “a truly amazing nerve, the superhighway of life responsible for keeping us alive and thriving in an ever-changing environment...an indispensable link in communication between brain and body.”<sup>133</sup>

Another significant piece of this communication system is the limbic part of our brain, located in the region to which the vagus nerve transmits its impulses. Stephen W. Porges, a researcher in the field of psychiatry, has coined the term *neuroception* as a capacity of the human body to evaluate information received through sensory input but processed at a level below conscious awareness for utilization by the limbic system to detect safety and risk. He writes that

Because of the phylogenetic heritage of mammals, neuroception can operate without cognitive awareness via relatively primitive mechanisms that are dependent on subcortical structures (e.g., limbic). As a product of evolution, new neural systems evolved in mammals that involved cortical regulation of subcortical structures and, in many instances, co-opted the defense functions of the primitive structures to support other functions including those related to reproductive behavior and pair bonding.<sup>134</sup>

Daugherty associates the limbic system with the “‘felt sense’ we experience throughout our day as well as with “learning, motivation, memory and emotion.” Such “felt sense” occurs at a level she calls “subconscious” or “implicit” and it is there where our bodies are “more honestly” aware than our conscious minds about the nature of our experience.<sup>135</sup> Here we may recall that Hartmann linked the limbic system, and primarily its amygdala, with the connections that are made in dreaming “guided by emotion.”<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Thayer and Lane, “Claude Bernard and the Heart–brain Connection,” 85.

<sup>133</sup> Mersbergen, “Viva La Vagus!,” 73.

<sup>134</sup> Stephen W. Porges, “Social Engagement and Attachment,” *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1008, no. 1 (December 1, 2003): 31–47, doi:10.1196/annals.1301.004.

<sup>135</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 49.

<sup>136</sup> Hartmann, *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*, 65.

In *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, Daugherty describes a theory of how trauma and other emotionally-charged events and our limbic systems work together to create entrenched “imprints” of emotional “programming” that become habitual and reactive. Noting that we cannot be in both a “fear response state” and a state of “calm and connection” at the same time, the “stress, reactivity and emotional chaos” we experience keeps us from engaging heartfully with others and the world around us.<sup>137</sup> When we perceive ourselves as under threat, the limbic system “hijacks” our bodies, overloading us energetically, physiologically, and biochemically, causing our brain and neurons to fire in patterns that—if repeated often enough—are theorized to become imprinted as “neural nets.” The more we repeat certain thoughts, experiences, or “interpretations of events, the repeated firing of the neurons, in concert with the glial cells [that transfer information between neurons], starts to form long-term connections and create our individual life operating patterns.”<sup>138</sup> As a result, we become less capable of responding to the actual events of our world consciously, and can become “consumed” by routine patterns of unconscious response.<sup>139</sup>

The good news from the perspective of neuroplasticity and learning research is that such imprinted neural net patterns “can be rewired with new experience.” Yet it is not conscious or reasoned thought that is capable of making the change, but only “deeply felt *experience*, internal or external and *experience is an embodied phenomenon*...When we create a deeply felt alternative experience through heartfelt awareness we begin to re-code our subconscious.”<sup>140</sup> Kalsched notes a similar phenomenon between therapist and patient during the “right brain to right brain communication” that occurs when symbolic material is being explored. Evoking

---

<sup>137</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 39.

<sup>138</sup> *Ibid.*, 40–41.

<sup>139</sup> *Ibid.*, 46.

<sup>140</sup> *Ibid.*, 50.

Daugherty's description of imprinted unhealthy life operating patterns, he describes "anti-wholeness defenses" that may be reparable due to the brain's plasticity, but agrees that such repair is only possible through "immersion in the particularity of experience," especially the "implicit experience in dreams and other imaginal products" that colors the "potential space' that emerges 'between' the psychoanalytic partners."<sup>141</sup>

Through skimming the surface of what has recently been discovered about the vagus nerve and its functions, as well as our limbic system, we can connect this aspect of our neuroanatomy to bodily perception of environment, transmission of emotionally-rich "gut feelings" to the brain and its areas associated with dreaming, to Hartmann's theories regarding the emotional basis of image, emotional processing, memory consolidation, and learning, and to the potential for change through deeply felt healing experience. Certainly, the brain is involved in the processing of emotion, and/or is reflective of the presence of emotion in the body, but the involvement of the gut and vagus nerve in emotion show that emotion is not "housed" within or generated solely by the brain. Daugherty would agree, noting that "The brain and the body work together in an awesome and staggering system that facilitates and defines human life."<sup>142</sup> As Bulkeley asserts, brain processes "never operate in complete isolation but are always parts of dynamic networks of widely distributed neural systems that constantly influence and shape each other's functioning."<sup>143</sup>

---

<sup>141</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 179.

<sup>142</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 44.

<sup>143</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 203.



## *Implications*

If proven to be true, the implications of such a relational-imaginal theory of dreaming could be far-reaching. Now, we can see ourselves as intimately related to God and world and capable of receiving information that we can use to adapt to our ever-changing environments. Moreover, all of this can be experienced within our own immediate and most intimate embodied lives. It is a “general empirical principle” for Bernard Loomer that “knowledge is derived from and confirmed by physical experience”; it is through physical feelings that we “meet and absorb the elemental forces of our existence.” This is far from mundane; no, the very “heights and depths of life, the unmanageable and efficacious undertows of existence, and the transformative energies of creative interchange are known first through our bodily feelings.”<sup>144</sup> We must never discount our embodiment, because

Our human body is the instrument through which we experience life, and the instrument through which transformations are continually taking place. Most of us go through life completely unaware of this phenomenon, and, as such, fail to see one of the greatest tools of enlightenment at our disposal.<sup>145</sup>

We may struggle with the alienating effects of dualism and loneliness and we may suffer from the consequences of adverse childhood experience, but, always, “fresh ideas” are “blowing in from the world, the ecological psyche,” writes Hillman. Our human soul is both “afflicted” by this world and “commencing to turn with fresh interest” to it, because, “in this world soul the human soul has always had its home.”<sup>146</sup> Recognizing with Jung, Whitehead, and Hillman that we are “utterly one with the world,”<sup>147</sup> part of the “cosmos displaying its self-enjoyment,” and

---

<sup>144</sup> Bernard M. Loomer, “The Size of God,” in *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, ed. William D. Dean and Larry E. Axel (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987), 24.

<sup>145</sup> Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*, 73.

<sup>146</sup> James Hillman, “Forward,” in *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind*, ed. Theodore Roszak, Mary E. Gomes, and Allen D. Kanner (San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1995), xxiii.

<sup>147</sup> Jung, *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*, 382.

linked to it through feeling, aesthetics, image, and dream, we can then adopt an “aesthetic anthropology” where we understand ourselves as *homo aestheticus*—a “sense-enjoying, image-making creature...animals in an ecological field that affords imagistic intelligibility.”<sup>148</sup> Dreams may then become our most intimate companions, but only, as Lauter and Rupprecht remind us, if we “value our dreams by recording and befriending them,” and in so doing we can interpret them, learn from them, and even “understand the phenomena of the physical world both literally and symbolically.”<sup>149</sup>

## TELEOLOGY AND AN IMMANENT GOD

*This is the first, the wildest and the wisest thing I know: that the soul exists  
and is built entirely out of attentiveness.*  
~Mary Oliver<sup>150</sup>

In order to construct a theory that describes a *relational-imaginal God-Self* in the human being, we must traverse comparative territory once again to see if Whitehead and Jung are capable of making the functional movements necessary for this dance to succeed. Therefore, this section examines the ways Whitehead and Jung speak of vision, purpose, and the presence of God in the world. In Whiteheadian terms, we will explore initial aims, novelty, and creative transformation. In Jungian terms, we will explore the Archetypal Self, its relationship to the ego, and the role of the transcendent function to engender novelty in human experience. This comparison leads us immediately into a discussion of differentiation and unity.

---

<sup>148</sup> James Hillman, “Back to Beyond: On Cosmology,” in *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, ed. David Ray Griffin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990), 226–27.

<sup>149</sup> Estella Lauter and Carol Schreier Rupprecht, “Feminist Archetypal Theory: A Proposal,” in *Feminist Archetypal Theory: Interdisciplinary Re-Visions of Jungian Thought*, ed. Estella Lauter and Carol Scheier Rupprecht (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985), 233.

<sup>150</sup> Parker J. Palmer, “The Gift of Presence, The Perils of Advice,” *On Being*, April 27, 2016, <http://www.onbeing.org/blog/parker-palmer-the-gift-of-presence-the-perils-of-advice/8628>.

## Initial Aims and Creative Transformation

### *God in the World*

The process of concrescence begins with a subject objectifying its given past. But there would be no subject at all that canprehend its world and begin its selective process of objectification without God's evocation of that subject. God *as consequent* both prehends the actual world within which a subject will emerge and *is part of* that actual world. Because God desires for that subject to achieve intense satisfaction, God *as primordial* provides the lure, the initial subjective aim, that calls that subject into being. From that point forward, the emergent subject claims that aim for itself and makes its own decisions as to how it will form and what it will become.<sup>151</sup> In Whitehead's poetic prose, God's "tenderness is directed towards each actual occasion, as it arises. Thus God's purpose in the creative advance is the evocation of intensities."<sup>152</sup> God is then present in every event as both its "transpersonal" and its "unconscious" dimensions.<sup>153</sup> Whitehead sees God therefore, as the "principle of concretion," and as the "actual entity," the "ground of all order," that "[conditions] an originality in the temporal world" and which begins every entity's "self-causation."<sup>154</sup> Whitehead describes God's relationship to the world as one of mutual immanence, and writes that "It is as true to say that the World is immanent in God, as that God is immanent in the World."<sup>155</sup> In fact, God's "fullness of physical feeling is derived from the objectification of the world in God:

He shares with every new creation its actual world; and the concrescent creature is objectified in God as a novel element in God's objectification of that actual world. This prehension into God of each creature is directed with the subjective

---

<sup>151</sup> Mattingly, "Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects," 146.

<sup>152</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 161; Mattingly, "Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects," 147.

<sup>153</sup> Odin, *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism*, 159.

<sup>154</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 108, 244.

<sup>155</sup> *Ibid.*, 348.

aim, and clothed with the subjective form, wholly derivative from his all-inclusive primordial valuation.<sup>156</sup>

### *Initial Aims, Novelty, and Creative Transformation*

As shown in the previous chapter, if the end was determined strictly by the past, then there would be no actual freedom; instead, the end comes from the future as a lure or possibility, and it is God who “so orders possibility as to render it into a relevant lure for each new experience.”<sup>157</sup> It is this lure—without coercion—that constitutes there even being decision, and there is more “order and direction and novelty” in life than could be possible if all were determined by the past or by chance. “The initial aim,” according to Lee, reflects God’s purpose “that each entity attain value, that each entity strive for greater intensity, harmony, beauty (which is to say that creative *advance* is the overall characteristic of process).”<sup>158</sup>

It is through the initial aim that novelty enters the world, and so God is also understood as the “organ of novelty, aiming at intensification.”<sup>159</sup> This aim, this “innermost lure to live with satisfaction,” Jay McDaniel describes as the “divine breathing”<sup>160</sup> within us, while Cobb and Griffin understand the initial aim as the very “principle of creative transformation.”<sup>161</sup> Yet this principle is not generic for the entire world, but is “tailor-made for each entity’s context.” It occurs when an entity accepts and incorporates God’s initial aims as the best possible response to a situation, even though that transformation may require us to give up ways of being to which we have become attached or habituated. Whitehead links even these “discordant feelings” to the

---

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., 345.

<sup>157</sup> Lee, *The Becoming of the Church*, 94.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 94–95.

<sup>159</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 67.

<sup>160</sup> Donna Bowman and Jay McDaniel, eds., *Handbook of Process Theology*, annotated edition (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006), 238.

<sup>161</sup> John B. Cobb Jr. and David Ray Griffin, *Process Theology* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1976), 104.

ultimate aim of Beauty, because that which is discordant and imperfect can move us “from the tameness of outworn perfection to some other ideal with its freshness still upon it.”<sup>162</sup> For Cobb, one’s conflicts—such as tension in a young person between conservative “moral rigor” and “carefree spontaneity”—can result in a “larger perspective” that includes and appreciates both sides, thereby enriching and intensifying experience.<sup>163</sup> In Cobb’s view, creative transformation is “contextual and particular, challenging, noncoercive” and universally available whether acknowledged or not.<sup>164</sup> It is produced by the “creative love of God” and is involved in all “human creative love”; its movement is “toward the broadening of the anticipation of the future that is to be affected by one’s actions.”<sup>165</sup>

One’s individual actions—one’s contribution of value—are key in Whitehead’s philosophy of organism. Whitehead’s cosmos is *relational*—meaning that there are true individuals who experience the whole from their unique perspective and rupture the extensive continuum with a thrust and a thirst for becoming yet those individuals are always in relation to the larger unity. In this cosmos, individuals arise subjectively distinct from the whole, and then perish to once again return objectively to the whole, where they are harmonized and integrated by God into a unity. In this cosmos, the ongoing dance between oneness and multiplicity is the beautiful yet painful reality

---

<sup>162</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 257.

<sup>163</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 99–100.

<sup>164</sup> Monica A. Coleman, “An Exchange of Gifts: Process and Womanist Theologies,” in *Handbook of Process Theology* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006), 162–64.

<sup>165</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 100.

## The Archetypal Self, the Ego-Self Relationship, and the Transcendent Function

### *God in the Self*

Jung writes that all religious statements “are filtered through the medium of human consciousness” subsequently becoming “visible forms” or “images” that are “subject to manifold influences from within and without” while pointing to something “ineffable” that is ultimately inaccessible to us.<sup>166</sup> Within the human psyche is a “psychological God-image,”<sup>167</sup> and though Jung’s “religious unconscious does not require an external God or gods”<sup>168</sup> he strongly believed that the image in the psyche “corresponds” to “an original behind our images”—what he sometimes called “the Unspeakable itself.”<sup>169</sup> While the ego is the “seat of *subjective* identity,” the Self is the “seat of *objective* identity,” the “supreme psychic authority,” and “inner empirical deity.”<sup>170</sup> We meet this “Unspeakable” or “Other” especially in numinous experience, and though Jung did not fully equate this “archetypal presence” with God or Spirit, Ulanov writes that it

acts within us as if it knew about God and knew about how the Spirit moves in us. It centers us in a realm between ego and the unconscious, including them both. It connects us to others—all others, not just those in our own time and vicinity—and to our deepest, ownmost identity as well...It impresses us. We are moved to put ourselves under its authority. Or, we may be moved to fight against its presence tooth and nail.<sup>171</sup>

---

<sup>166</sup> C. G. Jung, *Psychology and Religion: West and East*, trans. R.F.C. Hull, Corrected, vol. 11, The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series (New York: Pantheon Books, 1963), 360.

<sup>167</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 77.

<sup>168</sup> Rowland, *Jung: A Feminist Revision*, 33.

<sup>169</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1963, 11:360.

<sup>170</sup> Edward F. Edinger, *Ego and Archetype: Individuation and the Religious Function of the Psyche* (Boston; London: Shambhala, 1992), 3.

<sup>171</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 10.

The Self is our pathway to wholeness as well as a “structuring or ordering principle” that “unifies the various archetypal contents” of the unconscious.<sup>172</sup> Singer sees it as a kind of connection point that belongs neither to the “ego sphere nor to the unconscious, and yet possesses access to each...participating in both.”<sup>173</sup> Edinger notes that the Self is symbolized as

wholeness, totality, the union of opposites, the central generative point, the world navel, the axis of the universe, the creative point where God and man meet, the point where transpersonal energies flow into personal life, eternity as opposed to the temporal flux, incorruptibility, the inorganic united paradoxically with the organic, protective structures capable of bringing order out of chaos, the transformation of energy, the elixir of life—all refer to the Self, the central source of life energy, the fountain of our being which is most simply described as God. Indeed, the richest sources for the phenomenological study of the Self are the innumerable representations that [humans have] made of the deity.<sup>174</sup>

In a way that suggests friendliness to Whiteheadian thought, Robertson describes the Self as “both process and goal,” a point that Wehr supports when she writes that “The beginnings of our whole psychic life seem to be inextricably rooted in this point, and all our highest and ultimate purposes seem to be striving towards it.”<sup>175</sup> Both the collective unconscious and the Self have a fluid quality: Jung calls the unconscious “the medium from which religious experience seems to flow”<sup>176</sup> and, in describing how much our images of God have changed throughout history, Jung speculates that “we can imagine God as an eternally flowing current of vital energy that endlessly changes shape just as easily as we can imagine [God] as an eternally unmoved, unchangeable essence.”<sup>177</sup> When he describes God as a “living spirit”, Jung recognizes its tendency to “outgrow” historical “forms of expression” and to be “eternally renewed” like ever-changing “leaves and blossoms on the stem of the eternal tree.”<sup>178</sup> Also evocative of God’s desire

---

<sup>172</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 3.

<sup>173</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 274.

<sup>174</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 4.

<sup>175</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 68.

<sup>176</sup> Shelburne, *Mythos and Logos*, 77.

<sup>177</sup> Jung, *Psychology and Religion*, 1963, 11:361.

<sup>178</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 244.

that each occasion live out its own intensity, Hoss writes that Jung's Self "[has] no deliberate plan outside of an urge towards self-realization."<sup>179</sup>

### *Transcendent Function: Novelty and Transformation*

Robertson claims that the archetypal Self represents the human "need for transcendence,"<sup>180</sup> a view shared by Ulanov who insists that individuals can only successfully resolve their inherent conflicts through combining a "sense of the beyond" with "living in the here-and-now." The Self is the transpersonal "originating reality behind our symbols," its "reach and breadth" are universal and infinitely varied and complex, yet it "wants to be lived in the present."<sup>181</sup> One of the ways the Self lives in our present moments is through what Jung called the "transcendent function," the source of novelty and creative flourishing in the human psyche.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the conscious and unconscious psyche have a compensatory relationship such that when one's conscious ego attitude leans too far in one direction, the unconscious presents material to balance or complement the conscious perspective. "The psychological 'transcendent function,'" Jung notes, "arises from the union of conscious and unconscious contents," and such contents are seldom in agreement.<sup>182</sup> Often the disagreement is between our "spiritual" desires and our more "instinctual" desires, but the psyche seeks to address its conflicts and does so by "presenting first one side of an argument and then the opposite."<sup>183</sup> The resulting tension may be painful enough to even create "violent disunion with oneself."<sup>184</sup> Yet to avoid this tension by sublimating one desire in favor of the other does not

---

<sup>179</sup> Hoss, "Evidence of Wisdom in Dreams."

<sup>180</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 212.

<sup>181</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, xi, 15.

<sup>182</sup> Jung, *The Portable Jung*, 273–74.

<sup>183</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, ix.

<sup>184</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 150.



generally resolve the problem; in fact, it often results in some kind of neurotic or physical symptom.<sup>185</sup> When an individual is willing to hold opposing perspectives without repressing either one, Jung explains, the fully conscious “confrontation of the two positions generates a tension charged with energy and creates a living, third thing—

not a logical stillbirth in accordance with the principle *tertium non datur* but a movement out of the suspension between opposites, a living birth that leads to a new level of being, a new situation. The transcendent function manifests itself as a quality of conjoined opposites. So long as these are kept apart—naturally for the purpose of avoiding conflict—they do not function and remain inert. In whatever form the opposites appear in the individual, at bottom it is always a matter of a consciousness lost and obstinately stuck in one-sidedness, confronted with the image of instinctive wholeness and freedom.<sup>186</sup>

The “third thing” is not merely an unsatisfying compromise but is actually “something new.”<sup>187</sup> Like Whitehead’s God who infuses novelty as the initial aim of an occasion’s becoming, in any moment, the human psyche and its Self “does not just repeat fixed contents but also participates in the continued process of creating the new. It is the new that transcends the clashing opposites in us, released from the torments of insoluble problems and functioning like the grace it is, streaming into us.”<sup>188</sup> According to Ulanov, when we cooperate with this flow of grace, we are capable of having an “ongoing conversation with a presence that touches us intimately and reveals itself as altogether Other.” Within such conversation, we are able to participate in a sacred “symbolic life” and “unfold in relation” to that “spiritual life that passes through our days like a colored thread.” As this Other becomes more visible in our lives, our ego “enlarges” and becomes more “provident,” always on the lookout for this Other that responds to our notice by

---

<sup>185</sup> Ibid., 150–51.

<sup>186</sup> Jung, *The Portable Jung*, 298.

<sup>187</sup> Robertson, *Jungian Archetypes*, 259.

<sup>188</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, x.

“eliciting our cooperation” even more.<sup>189</sup> Hoss illustrates this function as related to dreaming with a particular dream.

This initial dream illustrates the nature of dream imagery and Hartmann’s contention that dreams create new connections expressed in picture-metaphor, relating one entity as resembling another in some way, and that ‘these connections can often produce something new or at least show us something new.’ This was a dream of a woman who was having relationship problems with her husband that she didn’t fully understand. ‘I have a recurrent dream of being terribly angry with my husband, who I am running away from. These dreams continued until one night I turned around and faced my husband and looked at his face—it was my father’s face.’ Here the dream made the connection (father to husband) in a picture-metaphor that combined the two visually, and that was obvious enough to produce a new awareness, an awareness that perhaps the problems with her husband were in part based on unresolved issues with her father.<sup>190</sup>

As noted earlier, Whitehead describes a cosmos constantly moving between unity and multiplicity, where individuals arise subjectively but perish again into objective reality. Yet it is the value that individuals contribute to the whole that brings intensity and zest to the cosmos. There is a similar tension in Jung’s psychology between unity and differentiation and it is similarly related to value and enjoyment.

### **Individual Differentiation from Unconscious Unity**

#### *Birth of the Modern Self*

It is easy for contemporary humans to assume that our ideas about human identity and its place in the world have been true for all humans throughout history or, conversely, to dismiss prehistorical ways of being in the world as laughably superstitious or “magical.” We may assume that the triumphant vanquishing of any trace of animist participation mystique by Enlightenment rationalism signals the final truths of human progress and technological prowess. Alternatively,

---

<sup>189</sup> Ibid., ix.

<sup>190</sup> Hoss, “Evidence of a Cognitive Function within Dreams,” 4.

we may be tempted to grasp nostalgically for earlier, simpler times when the world was enchanted, goddess-based matriarchal societies lived peaceably together, “noble savages” exhibited romantic relations with a kinship creation, and all was right with the world. Yet, it is such either-or, dualistic thinking that continues to ricochet us between poles, serving only to drive us farther and farther apart. On the other hand, if we are willing to acknowledge both the gains and the losses of our subject-object orientation—and hold these in tension—we may witness the birth of new possibilities that transcend both poles. To do so, we must first understand how what we now know as the “modern self” came into being.

Richard Tarnas, cultural historian and professor of philosophy and depth psychology at the California Institute of Integral Studies dates the emergence of the “modern self” to the era between Pico della Mirandola’s “Renaissance manifesto for the human self” (1486) and René Descartes’ *cogito ergo sum* (1637).<sup>191</sup> The human being that announced itself in that period was

[D]ynamic, creative, multidimensional, protean, unfinished, self-defining and self-creating, infinitely aspiring, set apart from the whole, overseeing the rest of the world with unique sovereignty, centrally poised in the last moments of the old cosmology to bring forth and enter into the new.<sup>192</sup>

The “old cosmology” is what might be called “primal consciousness.” The primal human experienced her world as “permeated with meaning,” or “ensouled.” Such a world possessed its own interiority, creativity, and responsive intelligence.<sup>193</sup> “Primal experience,” writes Tarnas,

takes place, as it were, within a world soul, an anima mundi, a living matrix of embodied meaning. The human psyche is embedded within a world psyche in which it complexly participates and by which it is continuously defined. The workings of that anima mundi, in all its flux and diversity, are articulated through a language that is mythic and numinous. Because the world is understood as speaking a symbolic language, direct communication of meaning and purpose from world to human can occur...this participation mystique involves a complex sense of direct participation not only of human beings in the world but also of

---

<sup>191</sup> Tarnas, *Cosmos and Psyche*, 3.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>193</sup> Ibid., 16.

human beings in the divine powers, through ritual, and of divine powers in the world, by virtue of their immanent and transformative presence. The participation is multidirectional and multidimensional, pervasive and encompassing.<sup>194</sup>

The experience of the modern mind is much different.

[It] experiences a fundamental division between a subjective human self and an objective external world. Apart from the human being, the cosmos is seen as entirely impersonal and unconscious. Whatever beauty and value that human beings may perceive in the universe, that universe is in itself mere matter in motion, mechanistic and purposeless, ruled by chance and necessity. It is altogether indifferent to human consciousness and values. The world outside the human being lacks conscious intelligence, it lacks interiority, and it lacks intrinsic meaning and purpose. For these are human realities, and the modern mind believes that to project what is human onto the non-human is a basic epistemological fallacy. The world is devoid of any meaning that does not derive ultimately from human consciousness...For the modern mind, the only source of meaning in the universe is human consciousness.<sup>195</sup>

Yet, as next we will see, placing all meaning in the lap of individual human consciousness is a dangerous development.

### *The Ego-Self Axis*

The developmental journey that must be undertaken in order to establish the most healthy relationship between ego and Self is a key aspect of Jungian thought. Edinger, recognized by colleagues as “the most influential Jungian analyst in the United States from the 1950s until his death,”<sup>196</sup> describes the development of human identity as a process of differentiation of the individual conscious ego from an unconscious state of wholeness during which the ego completely identifies with the Self. In the infant, this is a natural state of “inflation” when the “small” ego has “arrogated to itself the qualities of something larger (the Self) and hence is blown up beyond the limits of its proper size.” The end result is that the infant “experiences itself

---

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid.

<sup>196</sup> Ford Burkhardt, “Edward F. Edinger, 75, Analyst And Writer on Jung’s Concepts,” *The New York Times*, August 2, 1998, <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/08/02/us/edward-f-edinger-75-analyst-and-writer-on-jung-s-concepts.html>.

as a deity” in a state of ego inflation or “original sin.”<sup>197</sup> Although our “original state of unconscious wholeness and perfection,” represented by the mythical Garden of Eden, certainly represents that oceanic and desirable oneness between humans, God, and nature, seen from within space-time reality, it is “an inflated state, a condition of irresponsibility, unregenerate lust, arrogance and crude desirousness. The basic problem,” cautions Edinger, “is how to achieve the union with nature and the gods, with which the child starts, without bringing about the inflation of identification.”<sup>198</sup> If the individual conscious ego does not separate from the Self (identification with the divine), an individual can experience delusions which assume “oneself is the center of the universe” and thereafter live only a “provisional life” marked by a refusal “to commit oneself to the moment.”<sup>199</sup> In order to live a whole and authentic life,

[One] must give up [one’s] identification with original unconscious wholeness and voluntarily accept being a real fragment instead of an unreal whole. To be something in reality [one] must give up being everything in *potentia*. The *puer aeternus* archetype is one of the images of the Self, but to be identified with it means that one never brings any reality to birth.<sup>200</sup>

On the other hand, accepting one’s limitations brings an appreciation of time as precious as well as greater creativity, productivity, and relatedness. Here, as with Whitehead, we see that what is actualized is particular and short-lived.

Much of feminist theology equates ego with masculine power or pride and then distances most women’s typically relational and self-denying psyche from the male-privileged “heroic ego.” Yet Edinger notes that an overabundance of humility or guilt is equally inflationary, just in the negative direction. “In fact,” he writes, “taking on oneself too much of anything is indicative of inflation because it transcends proper human limits. Too much humility as well as too much

---

<sup>197</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 61.

<sup>198</sup> Ibid., 11.

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., 13–14.

<sup>200</sup> Ibid., 14.

arrogance, too much love and altruism as well as too much power striving and selfishness, are all symptoms of inflation.”<sup>201</sup> The Garden, then, is understood as the setting for the “birth of consciousness” with its new awareness of the opposites. In this understanding, “eating the forbidden fruit marks the transition from the eternal state of unconscious oneness with the Self (the mindless, animal state) to a real, conscious life in space and time. In short, the myth symbolizes the birth of the ego.”<sup>202</sup>

The ego is born and the “old state of undifferentiated consciousness”<sup>203</sup> dies; consciousness is won, but the Self is lost; non-distinction is left behind, alienation is the tragic gain. The state of alienation, marked by expulsion from the Garden, is a necessary and desirable step but disconnection from the Self is “most undesirable”<sup>204</sup> because the Self is “vitaly important to psychic health. It gives foundation, structure and security to the ego and also provides energy, interest, meaning and purpose. When the connection is broken the result is emptiness, despair, meaninglessness and in extreme cases psychosis or suicide.”<sup>205</sup> But “just as the experience of active inflation is a necessary accompaniment of ego development,” asserts Edinger, “so the experience of alienation is a necessary prelude to awareness of the Self”;<sup>206</sup> this process is marked by a conscious ego that is initially “antagonistic to the unconscious.”<sup>207</sup>

The key word is “initially.” Such a state of antagonism and alienation from unconsciousness must not be permanent. It is necessary to develop what Edinger calls the ego-Self axis, a relationship in which the ego is subordinated to the Self, but is constantly in relation to it and nourished by it. Ego-Self separation is seen as a task of the “first half of life” by

---

<sup>201</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>203</sup> Fraser N. Watts, *Theology and Psychology* (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2002), 121.

<sup>204</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 43.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid., 48.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., 20.

analytical psychologists while ego-Self reunion is a task of the second half. Yet it is not as clearly differentiated as this description might indicate. Instead, Edinger describes it as a “circular” process during which ego-Self union and ego-Self separation occur repeatedly in cyclic fashion.<sup>208</sup> Such a process brings a dependable ego-Self axis into consciousness.<sup>209</sup> At the individual level, then, the move is from a state of ego identification with the Self while at the collective level, the move is from a state where “the individual identity had been subordinated to the family, tribe, or religion”<sup>210</sup> to a state where the individual identity is unique, creative, and autonomous. As Fraser N. Watts notes, “the journey of the ego back into relationship with the Self parallels the journey of humanity back into relationship with God.”<sup>211</sup> The idea of this relationship between ego and divine Self has resonances in Whitehead’s thought, where God and world, permanence and fluency, *require* each other<sup>212</sup> but they are not collapsed monistically into an undifferentiated unity. Carol Christ notes that for process thinkers, although individuals *exist in* God/dess, those individuals are *distinct from* God/dess and therefore capable of entering into real relationship with God/dess.<sup>213</sup>

### *The Ego and Terror Management*

In modern society, the problem is not necessarily the myth of the hero’s journey as Keller and many feminists have claimed, but the fact that within Western society’s power-driven

---

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 5.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid., 21. Unbeknownst to me until this very writing, Edinger notes that the initiation of “a whole new attitude and orientation” is commonly imaged in dreams as “being bitten by a snake,” and such “transition” dreams are recognized to be “of considerable importance.”

<sup>210</sup> J. Pittman McGehee and Damon J. Thomas, *The Invisible Church: Finding Spirituality Where You Are* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008), 110.

<sup>211</sup> Watts, *Theology and Psychology*, 121.

<sup>212</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 199.

<sup>213</sup> C. Christ, *She Who Changes: Re-Imagining the Divine in the World* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 46.

culture, the story-pattern is not lived out in complete form and can sometimes be dualistically and essentially associated only with men.<sup>214</sup> Keller writes that

[The] philosophical descendent [of the archetypal hero] is the separate, self-enclosed subject, remaining self-identical throughout its exploits in time. Its relations do not affect its essence. Indeed, to sustain its sense of independence, such a subject is always liberating itself from its bonds as though from bondage. Intimacy, emotion and the influence of the Other arouse its worst anxieties, for somehow it must keep relation external to its own being, its 'self.'<sup>215</sup>

Yet, is the archetypal pattern of the hero's journey the culprit or is the real problem rather that we are typically unwilling to face the necessary abyss in the cycle and remain there until the new relationship with Self is forged? As opposed to this necessary deepening, we claw our way back in a psychological regression to the ascended heights of success—or the descended lows of self-negation—and remain stuck in an inflated ego position, always the hero, yet never reconnected to our divine source of Life. The reunion with Self always requires the death of the conscious ego attitude, a move which the modern self cannot tolerate. The ego who thinks it is “master in its house” cannot stand to be shown that its “feeling of supremacy” is “ultimately illusory,” as happens during the process of individuation.<sup>216</sup>

If this current atomistically heroic and individualistic worldview exacerbates our alienation and suffering, why is it clung to so tightly? Michael Kearney, Medical Director of the Palliative Care Service at Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, points us toward Terror Management Theory (TMT), a theory developed by Solomon, Greenberg, and Pyszczynski with roots in the work of Ernest Becker's *The Denial of Death*.<sup>217</sup> Originally formulated to understand why social and cultural minorities are persecuted, the theory is based on the understanding that the

---

<sup>214</sup> This is beginning to change, as women have begun to claim the cycle for themselves, sometimes using the hero epics but often using such myths as the descent of Inanna or of Persephone as feminine developmental patterns.

<sup>215</sup> Keller, “Self and God: Separation, Sexism, and Self,” 86.

<sup>216</sup> Wehr, *Jung & Feminism*, 100.

<sup>217</sup> Michael Kearney, “Healing the Soul in a Culture of Fear,” in *Imagination and Medicine*, ed. Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak (New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009), 38.



“awareness of death is intolerable to humans” and is therefore “repressed.” Meanwhile, humans construct culture so as to have “symbolic immortality” and protection from “terror annihilation,” but that culture must then be protected at all costs. Any threat to the “dominant culture,” therefore, can spark a swift and powerful reactivity on the part of members marked by attempts to first, distance themselves from the threat, second, to “disarm” the threat through “assimilation,” and finally, if those attempts do not succeed, to “eliminate the threat.”<sup>218</sup> Kearney argues that the West’s intense focus on “rationalism, materialism, and literal thinking” have subjugated into the “minority culture” anything having to do with “body, depth, complexity, intuition, and direct experience.”<sup>219</sup> Keller may recognize this same dynamic at work in a Christian tradition that preferences a *creatio ex nihilo* while denigrating the kind of theistic theology that embraces a chaoidic matrix of creativity with which God and world are both entangled.<sup>220</sup> Aizenstat speaks of our addiction to rationalism and dualism quite starkly when he says that “To be stuck in one mode of consciousness all the time is a kind of pathology, just as if night were to disappear and the world was left to burn under the unending glare of the sun.”<sup>221</sup>

The Christian New Testament’s reference in the Gospel of John to the idea that “I must decrease and He must increase,” McGehee and Thomas argue, is talking about the process of individuation wherein one integrates one’s shadow and comes to be in “proper relation to Self.” This is generally a second-half-of-life task, when “the Self is called to take authority...When the voice of the Self speaks, it’s about truth, contrasted to the ego’s pleas for security and conformity.” McGehee and Thomas consider this to be “kingdom of God” work, in that it challenges us to “let go of our territorialism and judgments about the perceived inferiority of

---

<sup>218</sup> Ibid.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid.

<sup>220</sup> Keller, *The Face of the Deep*.

<sup>221</sup> Aizenstat, *Dream Tending*, 148.

others, because there is this transpersonal element of human consciousness that is severely violated by these projections.”<sup>222</sup> On the other hand, when we learn to live “for the Self,” we become “authentic and autonomous,” a state that can bring its own risks—as “institutions and power structures get suspicious about autonomy, because autonomy can lead to anarchy.” Yet, the authors remind us that autonomy’s “natural companion” is “responsibility.”<sup>223</sup>

An ego in proper relation to the Self is “paradoxically” both “dethroned and pivotal.” Dethroned, because it is no longer the “center of our identity”; pivotal, because it is now “tough enough and alert enough” to be in devoted “service to the Self.” In this new place of service to Self, we look for its presence and work, we are more capable of making conscious “crucial judgments using all our resources,” and we know our human limits and “willingly receive our interdependence with others.” We can now live larger, more fully and freely, more capable of welcoming of what is new. We participate in a “two-way mirroring process” wherein the ego seeks to mirror the Self and the Self mirrors us in a way that we now “know that we are known.” As Ulanov writes, “An Other exists in us, right at the center of us, and does not so much discover as uncover us. It collects all the bits of us which we can then re-collect and knows about our connection to the Transcendent.” This is a transformation that “is so momentous it must be likened to the resurrection and receiving of our name from God.”<sup>224</sup> Marjorie Suchocki, too, sees the lure from God in the initial aim as a “resurrection fitted” to each occasion as it forms.<sup>225</sup> This new relationship with Self changes our core identity from one that is static to one that is spiritually-fluid. As Singer describes it, “The sooner we realize it, the sooner we identify with the flowing stream (or any other metaphor of process which presents itself), the more likely we are

---

<sup>222</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 79.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid., 105.

<sup>224</sup> Ulanov, *The Functioning Transcendent*, 21–27.

<sup>225</sup> Bowman and McDaniel, *Handbook of Process Theology*, 186.

able to become free of pointless struggles and fruitless conflicts. Thus, we liberate our energies for that collaboration with nature, which is self-realization in the highest sense.”<sup>226</sup>

### **Construction: A Relational-Imaginal God-Self**

Both Whitehead and Jung were concerned with the flourishing of all, and as was shown above, such flourishing is inherently tied to guidance given by transpersonal reality for novelty and transformation. We have already examined teleology and an immanent God in Whitehead and Jung, and the role of purposive vision offered to individuals for their own flourishing. Having done this groundwork, I can now construct a theory of *a relational-imaginal God-Self* in the human being.

Whitehead understands God as the “organ of novelty, aiming at intensification,”<sup>227</sup> and such intensity of experience is a favorable goal for societies. In Sections VI and VII of his chapter on the Order of Nature in *Process and Reality*, Whitehead discusses societies of occasions and how they handle environments that are changing regarding their degree of structure and level of complexity. He argues that societies that are less complex will be more stable overall, but will suffer from a lack of intensity of experience. On the other hand, societies that are more complex and more heterogeneous will be less stable and therefore less likely to survive.<sup>228</sup> Ideally, a society should be complex while at the same time able to respond positively to change and to advance in novelty, yet retain enough order and stability to be able to endure. But how can a society achieve this?

---

<sup>226</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 420.

<sup>227</sup> Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 67.

<sup>228</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

Whitehead posits two ways, both of which depend on “enhancement of the mental pole, which is a factor in intensity of experience.”<sup>229</sup> The first is through “blocking out unwelcome detail” in the variety of members of a nexus, and the second is by developing one’s ability to “receive the novel elements of the environment into explicit feelings with such subjective forms as conciliate them with the complex experiences proper to members of the structured society.”<sup>230</sup> Restated in a slightly more “digestible” way, the first way one can enhance one’s mental pole is through what Whitehead elsewhere calls *transmutation*—or the way in which we eliminate the preponderance of detail from our perception of persons or situations (what Whitehead called societies of occasions or nexuses) by distilling the predominant characteristics to perceive a unified whole.<sup>231</sup> The second way is by improving one’s ability to discern the initial aims presented by God that offer novel ideas appropriate to oneself, and then integrating and aligning with those initial aims during one’s process of concretion. The member, and the society, that achieves this will then enjoy more intensity of experience and more stability as well. For Jung, proper relationship between ego and Self allows for the greater operability of the transcendent function, bringing both new ways of experiencing life and a new identity that is in service to the divine purposes.

What new possibilities emerge when we bring together Whiteheadian ideas on initial aims and creative transformation with Jungian perspectives on the Self, the ego-Self axis, and the transcendent function? In Whitehead’s system each momentary occasion is lured through an initial aim at satisfaction, but those aims are given for momentary occasions, not for whole persons. Therefore, if those aims disappear as every momentary subjective unity perishes into

---

<sup>229</sup> Ibid.

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., 101–2.

<sup>231</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 143–44.

objectivity, how would it be possible for a *person*—a society of many, many occasions all popping at once—to ever discern what God’s aims might be within the course of one’s *life*? Everything a whole person experiences is in the aggregate, yet it is unclear in Whitehead’s thought if initial aims are ever aggregated in such a way that a living human being may act on them. On the other hand, within the Jungian frame, we may understand the Self as a pattern or archetypal complex that is both organizing and teleological; in a sense, the Self—as an archetypal pattern—serves as a “lattice” structure around which its contents for wholeness are collected. Generatively synthesizing these two schools of thought allows us to construct a theory of a *relational-imaginal God-Self* that addresses limitations of both systems to enhance the flourishing of individuals.

We now interweave process views of personal unity, memory, and Keller’s sense of “soul” as related to causal efficacy and the flow of the world’s experience. In a Whiteheadian view of personal unity, the “self” is not substantialist, it does not endure through time in a substantial way. It is not fixed, self-contained, or self-sufficient, but is inherently relational. My “self” is processive and ever-changing; it is a strand of unity, a historic route of occasions, and the “flow of the body’s experience.” Such unity, according to Les Muray, is tied to memory in that “my past selves are constitutive of my present momentary self.”<sup>232</sup> Another piece of the frame can be drawn from Keller’s use of Jung’s collective unconscious and Whitehead’s causal efficacy in her theorizing about *soul*. She describes the flow of perishing “occasions of experience” as creating “a looping effect, something like a stylized border of waves on a Greek vase, joining the moments without merging or generalizing them into numerical self-identity.” She defines “soul” as a combination of one’s personal route of experiences with the “channeling

---

<sup>232</sup> Leslie A. Muray, *An Introduction to the Process Understanding of Science, Society and the Self: A Philosophy for Modern Humanity*, vol. 26, Symposium Series (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 20.

of the world's subjectivities through causal efficacy" for that processive self. Because causal efficacy is the "internalization of the relevant world," it is the

place of soul—in the liminal zones of transition from subject to subject. Soul is the connexity of a subject to past and future; yet one's past personality is only one current in an ocean of influences entering the moment's experience. The momentary subject can be said in this system to perish into soul, or soul into the emergent subjectivity; but simultaneously, the world itself is perishing, melting, into each moment of soul, and soul perishing into world.<sup>233</sup>

For her, "self" is "subject" or "any given moment of experience" while "soul" is "only a special temporal arrangement of such subjects." Soul is also within the world "as the 'indwelling Eros,' the 'primordial nature of God,' immanent in every occasion as its own 'initial aim.'"

In these ways, we can view the God-Self as a relational process, but what about this theory makes this God-Self *imaginal*? Here we draw from Slusser who suggests that—at least for humans—the initial subjective aim is "an imaginal process." Similar to how Jung understands archetypal patterns as the basis of all matter and energy, current views in quantum physics describe the base of things as "organic, dancing patterns of energy." Slusser sees no reason not to make the leap from "pattern to image" wherein "the path of consciousness may be that of perceiving or realizing patterns as images." Moreover, with both Whitehead and Jung,

there is something like intentionality to the aims or images, and both connect them directly or indirectly to the divine. Also, with each thinker there is the possibility that this divine suggestion may be ignored in some measure. This initial subjective aim may 'suffer simplification and modification in the successive phases of concrescence.'<sup>234</sup>

What is being theorized here is that we can understand initial aims as also following a "historic route" and as aggregated for each individual through memory. Both our understanding of initial aims and of personal unity within a Whiteheadian frame are enriched by incorporating

---

<sup>233</sup> Keller, "Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection," 141–42.

<sup>234</sup> Slusser, "Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth," 88.

an archetypal understanding because we can now understand the unifying piece as a “complex,” “lattice,” or “framework” around which the images of one’s life experience or initial aims are collected. We also gain by applying Whiteheadian thought to Jung’s concept of the archetypal Self because we can now ontologically describe its fluid quality while still retaining its unity and power. A *relational-imaginal God-Self* then is the historic route of one’s initial aims, collected as images around a unifying center that exists as a connecting point where the transpersonal energies of God flow into personal life with the capacity to structure and order our experience of novel aims in such a way as to spur creative transformation through the transcendent function. This presence of God in the individual evokes our intensities, harmonizes our contrasts, and, when we live in proper relationship to it, we can more fully actualize God’s aims for greater flourishing.

## SUMMARY

In this chapter, I have shown how the theoretical and empirical systems of Whitehead and Jung can be generatively synthesized to enhance our understanding of body-mind-world experience in both human dreaming and in human transformation toward novel expressions. Moreover, I have shown how this synthesis reveals that such human experience is deeply related to God and to God’s activity within both the wider world and individuals. Yet such knowledge and understanding is impotent unless it can be intentionally and regularly accessed in ordinary human lives and thereby *experienced as lived reality*. Now we must incorporate *practice*.

## CHAPTER 8:

### TRANSFORMATION

The search for reason ends at the shore of the known; on the immense expanse beyond it only the ineffable can glide. We do not leave the shore of the known in search of adventure or suspense or because of the failure of reason to answer our questions. We sail because our mind is like a fantastic seashell, and when applying our ear to its lips we hear a perpetual murmur from the waves beyond the shore. Citizens of two realms, we all must sustain a dual allegiance...

—Abraham Joshua Heschel

I have often preached that if people ever got a whiff of the true Gospel, the churches would soon be empty. For most pew-sitters, the message would seem so scandalous that they would walk out, if not run, as if the buildings were on fire. The few who stayed behind wouldn't remain much longer, for the Gospel they would hear would be so empowering they wouldn't need the church, at least not in its current structure.

—J. Pittman McGehee, *The Invisible Church*

For God does speak—now one way, now another—though no one perceives it. In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falls on people as they slumber in their beds...

—Job 33:14-15

## INTRODUCTION

In the previous chapter, a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming* was constructed as well as theory of a *relational-imaginal God-Self in the human being*. All that is well and good, and yet stopping there in the quest to facilitate psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing would be premature. No, we must go deeper, to the level of *praxis*. In this final chapter, I will show how the suffering that inevitably comes within an embodied life that is always in the process of becoming can be healed through religious experience or mystical encounter with the sacred. We will also explore the meaning of the terms wholeness and flourishing in process and Jungian



thought, and touch on the validity of approaching dream work as a *spiritual* practice. Then, using the results of a qualitative exploratory study, we will gain a glimpse into the lived experience of Christian dream workers—especially in the context of those who attend the Haden Institute Summer Dream and Spirituality Conference in North Carolina—so as to evaluate the claim that dreams can be viewed as healing encounters with religious reality and foster human wholeness and flourishing.

### **A TRANSFORMATIVE RELATIONAL-IMAGINAL PRAXIS FOR PSYCHO-SPIRITUAL WHOLENESS AND FLOURISHING**

At this point in our journey it is apropos to revisit the conversation between Anderson and his parishioner. As his congregant noted,

[I]t was easy to agree to the omnipotence of God—that [God] could do everything—but what was of more immediate concern was whether God could do anything in particular. If it is important to know and believe that God is omnipresent—that [God] is everywhere present—one could readily assent, but what one really longed for was to discover God present in the small space of one's personal life.<sup>1</sup>

If we are to meet God in the small spaces of our personal lives, God must be available to us in a real way, *within the context of our embodied lives*. Such a view is not theologically unprecedented, as has already been noted in Tillich's theology, even if it is less widely appreciated. Whereas classical Christian theism often describes a God who is Absolute or the Unmoved Mover, Whitehead conceived of the relationship between God and the world as one of "process and possibility in mutual relationship"<sup>2</sup> where each is a datum received by the other, and where each influences—and *is influenced by*—the other. In Whitehead's philosophy of

---

<sup>1</sup> Ray S. Anderson, *The Shape of Practical Theology: Empowering Ministry with Theological Praxis* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2001), 12.

<sup>2</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead's Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 67.

organism, the infinite and finite, the eternal and temporal, are inextricably joined. Hopper claims Charles Olson as a “process poet” and quotes him as musing that “no event is not penetrated, in intersection or collision with, an eternal event.”<sup>3</sup> For Sarkar it is not simply that God and world are “mutually immanent,” but that these two realities are so bound up with each other that they “cannot be torn apart,

for, each temporal occasion embodies God, and is embodied in God. In God permanence is primordial, flux is derivative from the World, and, in the case of the World, flux is primordial, and permanence is derivative from God. God is the infinite ground of all mentality, the unity of vision seeking physical multiplicity.<sup>4</sup>

In Whitehead’s philosophy, “The world lives by its incarnation of God in itself.”<sup>5</sup> To realize this radical truth, individuals must be able to *meet* that God within embodied life, and experience the kind of *healing encounters* that can transform our alienation, loneliness, and suffering into wholeness and flourishing. Such encounter has always been understood in the field of spirituality to require some kind of *praxis*.

The need to go beyond theory is not new to most process thinkers, although process thought has often been guilty of remaining an intellectually-focused endeavor. In his essay on “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke an Ailing World,” Griffin makes this point especially clear when he suggests that those engaged in “metaphysical cosmology” need to “see our activity as therapy, as part of our practice to save the world from our own worst images.” He compels us to

bring out, much more explicitly than did Whitehead himself, and with all the rhetorical soul-transforming power we can muster, those features of this cosmology that can replace modernity’s deadening images of the world with the enlivening images suggested by this postmodern metaphysics, and that can help

---

<sup>3</sup> Hopper, “Once More: The Cavern beneath the Cave,” 109.

<sup>4</sup> Sarkar, *Whitehead’s Four Principles from West-East Perspectives*, 63.

<sup>5</sup> Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, Reissue (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927), 149.

our souls experience that mutual sacredness and bondedness which alone can reverse the current trajectory of death.<sup>6</sup>

Noting that “theory must be grounded in practice,” Griffin reminds us of Whitehead’s stance that “practice should be the final *test* of all theory.”<sup>7</sup> As decidedly *empirical*, Faber insists that process theology must not be content with “an ethical praxis of ‘creative transformation,’” but focused on “understanding such praxis as a spiritual encounter with God” so we might understand “God’s unique intimacy toward the world in the divine matrix.”<sup>8</sup>

### **Suffering and the Power of Healing Encounters**

In Chapter 3, we touched on the perpetual perishing, flux, and creativity at the heart of reality that results in both the suffering and the joy we experience. In this section, I will show that religious experiences—mystical encounters with sacred reality—can be powerful forces for healing in a world that is inherently tragic. Keller vividly describes our incarnational reality that continues to bleed despite classical theology’s discomfort:

If incarnation is always going on, so is the carnage. Residues of loss drift up opaque, nameless, without even the dignity of crucifixion...it is ‘men’s wrath,’ not the wrath of God, which performs the crucifixion. There is no deity who causes the suffering or rescues us from it; no divine life-saver. To incarnate intentionally the Wisdom may in fact heighten the risk of crucifixion; but the aim, the lure, is for new creation. This Sophia accepts no ‘blood payment;” her justice and her mercy do not organize themselves within the economies of sacrifice. Yet her creativity is not squeamish. Every death is within its capacity. Its births come spattered with blood. Its lives feed on each other. The religions of the book, however, while steeped in the blood of manly slaughter, have been queasy about the blood of life, the life of bodies. Having almost erased *tehom* from its book, our tradition has helped to rub out the living bodies. We receive back the flesh of faceless surfaces.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Griffin, “A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Locke Our Ailing World,” 249.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 248.

<sup>8</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 311.

<sup>9</sup> Keller, *The Face of the Deep*, 220.

In a somewhat similar way, the Ulanovs question our tendency to see the world only in oppositions between “good” and “evil” and transpersonal reality as ultimately only “good.” Whereas Whitehead separates *God* from *creativity* and Keller talks about a primordial chaotic *tehom* that is always part of our reality, the Ulanovs mix it up a little bit more by using Winnicott’s work in object relations. In this theory, the infant moves from relating to its mother image as self to “killing the mother” through its spontaneous expression, resulting in a relationship to the mother of “object usage” where the mother becomes objectively real yet still present for her child. The same movement can occur in our relations to God when we “kill” our psychological God-image<sup>10</sup> only to find that an objectively encountered God exists outside of our projection. “The transition of God from projection to reality,” the Ulanovs write, “is the final and most challenging test of the fact of evil. Evil in its various forms so defies our wishes, defeats our projections, and dismays our fantasies of a good and loving world where we will all be well and happy, that many people feel their projected image of God cannot survive the inevitable destruction of such an image.”

Their faith founders at precisely this point. Their image of God as good dies because evil flourishes. They do not notice that God survives this destruction in [God’s] own right. Those who do notice endure an extraordinary evolution in their religious sensibilities. They see that God is really ‘other,’ more so than they had risked perceiving before, and that evil is really a mystery, not a problem to be solved with childish wishes that everyone will somehow do the right thing. The profundity of sin throws into bold relief the transcendent otherness of a God even the goodness of whom cannot be simply identified with human conceptions of goodness. Our projections onto God shift to become means of perception, clues to God’s existence and to what are at most, in a manner of speaking of the unspeakable, partial aspects of [God’s] nature, no longer to be identified with [God’s] nature. Projections lead us far, to the edge of what we can perceive. They take on a salutary function, bowing before what exists on the other side. They point to it. They no longer define it.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> As I believe I did when I “broke up” with God (as described in the Introduction).

<sup>11</sup> Ulanov and Ulanov, *Religion and the Unconscious*, 40.

Again, tragedy cannot be avoided in a world marked by a riotous diversity of life in flux. As within the Whiteheadian understanding of freedom and multiplicity, in Jungian thought there is a similar level of importance placed upon decision and differentiation. In contrast to the classical Christian belief that evil entered the world through human disobedience, McGehee and Thomas note Jung's view that evil is an "undifferentiated force in the world" that is "working itself into human beings through the human experience." He compares that to Sanford's assertion that "if all human beings disappeared in a moment, evil would still exist" and claims that a "more realistic viewpoint" would be to see humans as naturally dualistic "unless we become conscious and integrate these paired opposites of good and evil."<sup>12</sup> In fact,

In the Jungian viewpoint, evil is seen as an important element in the dynamic process of becoming conscious. The tension between good and evil as paired opposites continually forces us to decide, which affirms our lives and causes us to grow. If we don't have to decide, then we never really live. The root of *decide* means 'to kill or die,' helping us to see that every decision is both death dealing and life giving. The ability to decide is a large part of this grace and burden of being human.<sup>13</sup>

In Singer's discussion of Jung's *Seven Sermons to the Dead*, the *pleroma* is described as the primordial state where all the opposites negate each other. This is the unconscious unity within which there is no tension and no conscious differentiation, so all qualities are "balanced and void." It is due to conscious differentiation that the opposing forces become distinct and therefore "effective." In this way, humans are "the victims of the pairs of opposites. The *pleroma* is rent in us." As is any "self-regulating system," the psyche, too, is inherently polar. Human distinctiveness—value—is achieved not by "striving" after "the good or the beautiful," which only leads us to "forget our own nature." If we work to achieve only one polar value we invariably "lay hold of" its opposite, but "when we remain true to our own nature, which is

---

<sup>12</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 101.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 103.

distinctiveness, we distinguish ourselves from the good and the beautiful, and therefore, at the same time, from the evil and the ugly.” To do otherwise is to fall into “nothingness and dissolution”;<sup>14</sup> or, as Keller might phrase it, to do otherwise is to fall into the *tehomitic* abyss.

Yet it is not just decision and opposition that cause suffering and neuroses; early life trauma seems to be yet another influential factor. Young-Eisendrath and Hall discuss the “heavily defended person” that results in a “pathological false self,” split from one’s shadow that then becomes “inaccessible to ordinary awareness.”<sup>15</sup> The need for such heavy defenses arises, according to Donald Kalsched, because “Early relational trauma results from the fact that we are often given more to experience in this life than we can bear to experience *consciously*.”<sup>16</sup> Though less than ideal, the self-divisions that result from early trauma have “survival value.” They are part of a “self-care system” that saves at least some of the child’s “innocence and aliveness” through “sequestering” it in the unconscious where it can be retrieved later for “possible future growth.” Kalsched argues that those who experience early childhood trauma or adverse experience are prematurely thrown into a “non-ordinary reality” wherein an “implicit narrative” comes alive; this “other world” is not created by the trauma, but is, as Jung described, an “archetypal or mytho-poetic world already there” that “surrounds the fractured soul with a dramatic *story* from the archetypal repertoire of the ancient psyche...” The “implicit narrative” that then surrounds this split off part of the self is made explicit in dreams and other nondirected thinking through what Kalsched calls “trans-egoic powers” or “personified presences” that exist in the “mytho-poetic matrix between reality and fantasy”<sup>17</sup> (similar to what Winnicott called “transitional space”).

---

<sup>14</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 384.

<sup>15</sup> Young-Eisendrath and Hall, *Jung’s Self Psychology*, 29.

<sup>16</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 10.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 4.

This fracturing and subsequent recruitment of unconscious powers “allows life to go on,” notes Kalsched, “albeit at a terrible price—i.e., loss of the animation and vitality that have always been associated with ensouled living.”<sup>18</sup> Another unfortunate result of such traumatic experience is the internalization of what Anaïs Nin referred to as “deforming mirrors.” Kalsched describes these as “distorted ways in which we are often seen by others [that] become the ways in which we see ourselves—inner deforming mirrors.” These then become “*anti-wholeness factors* in the psyche” that “dis-integrate and fragment us,” eventually becoming habitual and perpetuating suffering through the adoption of chronically negative self-identifications.<sup>19</sup> Such negative views of the self that result from alienation and rejection often then lead to violence. As Edinger explains, “Whenever one experiences an unbearable alienation and despair it is followed by violence,” and this can either be self- or other-inflicted. “In extreme forms,” he continues, “this means either murder or suicide. The crucial point is that at the root of violence of any form lies the experience of alienation—a rejection too severe to be endured.”<sup>20</sup>

When McGehee and Thomas ask, “How did we ever get to be so un-whole, so broken in the first place?” they explain that it is all-too-human to be divided against ourselves because of the inherent psychological struggle between what is conscious and what is unconscious.<sup>21</sup> In a resonant way, Whitehead believed that philosophy must be the “critic of abstractions” and make explicit those unconscious—and often conflicting—presuppositions upon which our statements and actions are based.<sup>22</sup> How, exactly, can we do that? If an individual is torn asunder inside, feels unworthy to exist, and is incapable of recognizing or responding to what spontaneously

---

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 11, 23–24, 30.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 159.

<sup>20</sup> Edinger, *Ego & Archetype*, 44.

<sup>21</sup> McGehee and Thomas, *The Invisible Church*, 49.

<sup>22</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 5.

arises from the unconscious and the environment, surely, this must be—at least in part—what lies at the root of the correlation between adverse childhood experiences (ACEs) and adult disease and risky behavior. Yet the current biomedical model has no way in which to understand such possible linkages. Epperly, drawing from George Engel, describes the biomedical model of health and illness as both reductionistic and dualistic, noting that although that model has successfully addressed a significant number of health problems, “its failure to address the spiritual and emotional lives of patients renders it ineffective in dealing with chronic and terminal illness, patient responsibility for self-care, and bioethical decision-making.” He continues,

Its technological orientation has saved countless lives and will continue to do so, but, on its own, the purely somatic approach is unable to address the deeper issues of meaning and values that are raised by critical illness and mortality. In its isolation of the patient from significant spiritual, relational, and environmental resources, biomedicine has added to the suffering of many patients. Further, its adherence to a linear cause and effect understanding of reality has blinded it to the impact of economics, emotions, spirituality, and the environment on issues of health and illness.<sup>23</sup>

The results of our alienation—and our adverse childhood experiences—are the myriad of symptoms elaborated in Chapter 1 of this current work. Certainly wounding, dualistic worldviews have played a part, but as Bulkeley and Zimmerman argue, coming to an intellectual appreciation of a non-dual worldview cannot transform our behavior. According to Daugherty, conscious awareness alone cannot move us out of reactive mode. Only deeply felt *experience* of a transformative nature has any hope of changing our lives.

Pargament, Hood, and Walter Houston Clark have all made compelling claims about the healing power of religious or mystical experience. In describing Hood’s research, Pargament

---

<sup>23</sup> Bruce G. Epperly, “Process Theology and the Healing Adventure: Reflections on Spirituality and Medicine,” in *Handbook of Process Theology*, ed. Donna Bowman and Jay McDaniel (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006), 95.



explains that mystical experiences—even though such experiences are incredibly varied— are “generally marked by powerful emotions, consisting of feelings of numinous consciousness and feelings of unity.” The sacred object encountered is “perceived to be absolutely real—‘a foundational reality’ in the words of Hood” and such experiences “can have long-lasting, life-altering effects.”<sup>24</sup> Clark’s understanding of mystical experience is key to making spirituality and religion more relevant today. He argues that while mystical experience is the essential principle that makes religious consciousness religious, ecstatic experience does not seem to be limited to believers, and such experiences can be triggered through art, music, and other such imaginal elements. The experiences themselves are strongly similar, and Clark believes that it is primarily the interpretation or the theology that differentiates the religious mystical experience from the secular ecstatic experience. For this project, it is his central conviction that only religious or mystical experience can produce the kind of profound changes to personality that such experiences engender that is of utmost interest, because it is only in such “shattering” experiences where one comes face-to-face with oneself that can effect long-lasting changes to values and behavior. Mystical experiences are often interpreted as a “union” with a divine presence. Some researchers theorize this to be a return to the blissful experience of unity with one’s mother, but Clark’s work shows mystical experience to be more like a “rebirth” than a regression, because those who have experienced such an encounter claim a new power to be loving and compassionate with others.<sup>25</sup> The facilitation of more mystical experiences of “rebirth” may be the only way the Church can have any real impact on the human condition. How can we understand the outcome of such experiences?

---

<sup>24</sup> Pargament, *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy*, 70–71.

<sup>25</sup> Walter Houston Clark, “The Psychology of Religious Experience,” in *Current Perspectives in the Psychology of Religion*, ed. H. Newton Malony (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), 230.

## Wholeness and Flourishing

As can be easily discerned by looking at the title of this project, the ultimate point of this work is the facilitation of psycho-spiritual *wholeness and flourishing*. As has been taught *ad nauseum* in business or strategic planning retreats, one cannot point one's ship in the right direction if one has not determined the destination. We must describe what success looks like—what its indicators are—if we are going to prove a means of getting there. Such is the point of this section wherein we will examine both Whiteheadian and Jungian understandings of wholeness and what it means to flourish.

As already noted, Whitehead and Jung agree that there is a certain inevitability of dualism at the heart of reality and of our psychic lives. For Whitehead, “The universe is dual because, in the fullest sense, it is both transient and eternal.” Moreover,

The universe is *many* because it is wholly and completely to be analyzed into many final actualities...The Universe is *one* because of the universal immanence. There is thus a dualism in this contrast between the unity and the multiplicity. Through the universe there reigns the union of opposites which is the ground of dualism.<sup>26</sup>

As has already been discussed at length, Jung described the psyche as having an inherent polarity, resulting in the tension of opposites that we cannot avoid but which we can transcend. It is this transcendence of the opposites—while holding the contrast of both and rejecting neither—that is at the heart of how wholeness is understood in both systems. Singer writes that “in the framework of wholeness there is a harmony in which everything is included.”<sup>27</sup> Whitehead, too, speaks of the Harmony that is yet possible within the contrasts and discordant elements. The discord in reality cannot be blocked out, as that would result in what Whitehead called

---

<sup>26</sup> Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas*, 190.

<sup>27</sup> Singer, *Boundaries of the Soul*, 350.

“anaesthesia,” but even when elements cannot be harmonized “as they stand,” if we are willing to hold them in tension, Cobb and Griffin insist that

there may be a larger, more inclusive novel pattern in which they can both be contained, in such a way that the contrast between them contributes to the intensity of the whole...Insofar as this pattern is embodied, the occasion is creatively transformed in relation to its predecessors. Mutually exclusive elements in its world become effective contrasts contributing to the strength of beauty—that is, the enjoyment—of the whole.<sup>28</sup>

For the individual, Cobb describes wholeness as “at-homeness.” Such people are

‘at-home’ in their bodies, in their conscious and unconscious feelings and senses, in their human relationships, and in their total natural environment. They are ‘at-home’ with who they are, and therefore they are comfortable being just that. Because they are ‘at-home’ in themselves, they are free from defensiveness toward others. Others experience their warmth—that is their openness, their concern, and their affection. One is not the object of good deeds or just treatment from the whole person. One is the recipient of acceptance and understanding.<sup>29</sup>

For many, the central aspect of the experience of wholeness may be the greatest challenge of all—the acceptance of oneself. Jung writes that to be forgiving of others, to act in a caring way in the world, and even to “love my enemy in the name of Christ” are all “great virtues.”

But what if I should discover that the least among them all, the poorest of all beggars, the most impudent of all the offenders, the very enemy himself—that these are within me, and that I myself stand in need of the alms of my own kindness—that I myself am the enemy who must be loved—what then? As a rule, the Christian’s attitude is then reversed; there is no longer any question of love or long-suffering; we say to the brother within us ‘Raca,’ and condemn and rage against ourselves. We hide it from the world; we refuse to admit ever having met this least among the lowly in ourselves. Had it been God himself who drew near to us in this despicable form, we should have denied him a thousand times before a single cock had crowed.<sup>30</sup>

As will be shown later through the results of a qualitative study of Christians who use Jungian-influenced dream work as a spiritual practice, such self-acceptance and transformation

---

<sup>28</sup> Cobb Jr. and Griffin, *Process Theology*, 99.

<sup>29</sup> John B. Cobb Jr., “Wholeness Centered in Spirit,” in *Spirit-Centered Wholeness: Beyond the Psychology of Self*, ed. H. Newton Malony, Michele Papen-Daniels, and Howard Clinebell (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 230.

<sup>30</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 235.

can result from the healing experiences that working with one's dreams and synchronicities may bring. Yet it is not only true that dream work can facilitate healing encounters with sacred reality, the argument herein is that within a relational-imaginal praxis, dream work can be a means of discerning God's initial aims and fostering *conscious transmutation*. As noted earlier, aligning with God's aims and transmutation—the blocking out of unwelcome detail—are two ways of enhancing one's mental pole and thereby allowing complex societies to remain stable while still incorporating novelty and intensity. These separate methods of enhancing the mental pole—transmutation and discerning God's initial aims—are the very heart of what we might consider to be a *relational-imaginal praxis* for psycho-spiritual wholeness.

Transmutation is a “method of simplification” that allows us to focus our attention “on the important groupings of occasions (enduring objects) in our immediate environment.”<sup>31</sup> The detail that can be considered “irrelevant” is subsumed, differences are eliminated, and the “actual world is felt as a community.” Whitehead considers transmuted feelings to be akin to “propositional prehensions” or “propositional feelings” and Hosinski argues that they “arise at unconscious levels of experience, as well as acquiring consciousness in those occasions capable of intellectual feelings.”<sup>32</sup> Transmuted feelings allow us to “grasp this purpose or this intention consciously” by abstracting from the “full detail of our experience.”<sup>33</sup> It is my contention that if transmutation is made more conscious, it is healthier for the individual, because unconscious emotional transmutation—caused by the entrenched behavioral patterns and psychological complexes that trigger emotional reactivity—leads to repetitive and unhealthy life operating patterns as well as bad decisions.

---

<sup>31</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 144.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 145.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, 146–48.

Yet recognizing our unconscious patterns and agendas is no easy task in contemporary America. Our modern world is heavily skewed toward “concentrated, directed conscious functioning” but with such imbalance comes the “risk of a considerable dissociation from the unconscious,” writes Jung. Such dissociation is problematic because

The further we are able to remove ourselves from the unconscious through directed functioning, the more readily a powerful counter-position can build up in the unconscious, and when this breaks out it may have disagreeable consequences...[such counter positions in the unconscious] can intervene again and again in [individuals'] lives in a disturbing and apparently unpredictable manner.<sup>34</sup>

In such instances, reactive patterns we have developed that result in our blocking out the detail of the real experience in front of us in favor of the projected imprint of emotional wounding and self-defeating thoughts prevent us from engaging in the world *as it is in the present moment*. In such cases, we are no longer responding to the dynamic flow of life, but reacting from the perspective of past experience. In Whiteheadian terms related to the material already explored on formalism and history, we are more likely to repeat the past unless we can perceive the propositions that join the past world with our novel aims, and raise these propositions from unconsciousness to the level of intellectual feelings so that they may be consciously evaluated.

Before our rationalistic side gleefully grabs the steering wheel, we must keep in mind that this is an emotion-heavy and value-soaked endeavor. Hosinski describes propositions as “lures for feeling formed by integrating an eternal object (form of definiteness) with physical prehensions of actual entities.”<sup>35</sup> Regardless of the truth or falsity of a proposition, its purpose is simply to “influence the concrescence of actual entities,” or to “lure our action” by “attracting us through value.”<sup>36</sup> While entertaining propositions, an actual entity unconsciously “feels” the

---

<sup>34</sup> Jung, *The Portable Jung*, 276–77.

<sup>35</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 105.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 100, 102.

difference between the “fact” of past entities and the “theory” of the new possibilities prehended; this is known as a propositional feeling and is an unconscious valuation. As noted in Chapter 3, if the integration phase of concrescence is prolonged even more, such a proposition may become an intellectual feeling, wherein the contrast between “what is” and “what might be” is both *felt* and *known* consciously.<sup>37</sup> The importance of consciousness to higher-level organisms and human society cannot be overstated—it is the consciousness achieved in intellectual feelings that allow the subject “to criticize [its] propositional lures.”<sup>38</sup> Hosinski indicates that

conscious intellectual feeling enables the concrescing subject to become consciously aware of at least some aspects of its complex unconscious experience ... [such intellectual feelings] assist the formation of the occasion’s subjective aim ... [and introduce] the critical ability to form a judgment before [the subject] commits itself to the possibilities contained in the propositional feelings ... without consciousness, valuations and commitments are ‘blind’ or unconscious.<sup>39</sup>

Consciousness lays the foundation for reason and rational thought, and brings such gifts as “increased intensity of experience,” and the ability to transcend the self toward loftier ideals and “a concern for truth, value, [and] quality of human activity and life.”<sup>40</sup> Moreover, “high grade,” conscious occasions bring novelty and originality to life. Symbols play a role in this process, as Whitehead’s symbolic reference is an intellectual feeling that has connected what is perceived through our senses with what is perceived through causal efficacy.<sup>41</sup> The knowledge that arises through intellectual feelings produces the data “which initiates rational or reflective thought,” and it is only “active thought” that can “save symbolically conditioned action from quickly relapsing into reflex action.”<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 108–13.

<sup>38</sup> Ibid., 115.

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 124.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 118.

<sup>42</sup> Whitehead, *Symbolism*, 82.

Again, Whitehead has suggested that conforming with God's initial aims is yet another way to enhance the mental pole and increase intensity of experience and enjoyment, yet there has been little guidance within Whiteheadian thought or process theology on how that is accomplished. Earlier, we connected eternal objects and archetypes, and propositions, propositional feelings, and archetypal images. We also posited a *relational-imaginal God-Self* as the historic route of initial aims. Here it is useful to combine Cobb's claim that "The primary aim of piety...is to conform one's decisions to the possibilities offered by God"<sup>43</sup> with his understanding that "the major way in which we can learn to conform more fully with the highest possibility for our life is not through consciously received impulses. The directive agency of God as the principle of growth and the lure of the future is subtler than that."<sup>44</sup> Armed with our *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*, and aware of a *relational-imaginal God-Self* within, combined with the recognition that our tasks are to 1) improve our conscious transmutation, 2) raise unconscious propositions to intellectual feelings, and 3) discern—and better conform to—God's initial aims, I now propose a transformative *relational-imaginal praxis of dream work for psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing*.

### **Dream Work as Spiritual Praxis**

A *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming* is a foundation upon which we can posit a praxis of dream work for harmonization of contrasts, discernment of aims, and conscious transmutation through raising unconscious propositions to intellectual and religious feelings resulting in more conscious decisions, less reactivity, better alignment with initial aims and more wholeness and flourishing. Let us now explore why this is considered a *spiritual praxis*.

---

<sup>43</sup> Cobb Jr., "Spiritual Discernment in a Whiteheadian Perspective," 359.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., 366.

Human spirituality has long been a topic of interest, although it has remained primarily a religious or theological matter until more recent decades when both the soft and hard sciences became interested in understanding this human behavior. From a psychological perspective, the core question about religion and spirituality has seemed to center on whether or not religiousness is a unique human behavior—one that requires a specific set of concepts and practices in approaching it systematically—or if religiousness can be reduced to some other more elemental human behavior. Related to that is whether religiousness should be looked at in this more reductionistic way or if it requires a more holistic approach wherein the data collected is understood within a wider field of scope. As well, researchers in brain science have been wiring experienced meditators to monitors to get a clearer picture of exactly what is happening on a physical level in the brain as people pursue such a practice.

There are also differences in the way spirituality has been defined. For example, Andrew Dreitcer focuses on spirituality as a “style of intimacy” one uses in approaching sacred reality.<sup>45</sup> Saint-Laurent describes spirituality as the “inner meaning of human experience” as people seek transformation under a particular sacred worldview,<sup>46</sup> and Pargament describes spirituality as the “search for the sacred.”<sup>47</sup> Another way to look at these various definitions is to say that spirituality can be approached as a “way of being,” as a “system of meaning,” or as a “technique” or set of practices. Which is “correct”? It is possible they all are. For purposes of this project, spirituality is defined as incorporating: 1) a way of perceiving *ultimate Reality*, 2) a set of tools or techniques to approach that Reality, and 3) the hope of being in some kind of

---

<sup>45</sup> Andrew Dreitcer, “Lecture Notes on ‘Spirituality and Spirituality Studies’” (Claremont School of Theology, Fall 2012).

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

<sup>47</sup> Pargament, *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy*, 32.



communion and transformative relationship with this Reality as a way of navigating the human experience.

Are dreams like a “sacred text” one can contemplate as in *lectio divina*? Or an imagistic icon one can “see through” to sacred Reality? Bulkeley cites the work of George J. Tanabe, Jr. with Buddhists who practiced “multiple techniques for generating visionary images, which were then shared, interpreted, and used as templates for future image-seeking pursuits.” The monks Tanabe studied “tried so hard to activate the image-creating faculty of their minds because they found the resulting dream-visions to be valuable guides in their ongoing quest for enlightenment.”<sup>48</sup> In a 2005 article in the *Journal of Counseling & Development*, Timothy L. Davis and Clara E. Hill detailed the results of a study that compared spiritual and non-spiritual approaches to dream work and concluded that their results “suggest the benefits of incorporating spirituality into dream interpretations for spiritually oriented clients.”<sup>49</sup> Clients in what they identified as the “spiritual condition” in the study “gained more spiritual insight into their dreams and gained more existential well-being than volunteer clients in the waking life condition.”<sup>50</sup>

For Faber, the spiritual experience that can creatively transform is one in which God is encountered “as event” and such a meeting places one “into the *decision of conversion* (metanoia).” This experience of “rapture” then leads to “a spirituality of love, of self-surrendering, kenotic love, in which we follow God on God’ path *into* the turmoil and disjunction of the world” rather than trying to escape it. Here, spirituality is “being ‘placed’ *within* the ‘event’ of God, under God’s ‘stature,’ which refers to the breadth and intensity of an

---

<sup>48</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 129.

<sup>49</sup> Timothy L. Davis and Clara E. Hill, “Spiritual and Nonspiritual Approaches to Dream Work: Effects on Clients’ Well-Being,” *Journal of Counseling & Development* 83, no. Fall 2005 (Fall 2005): 492.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 499.

event's *integration* of world with the aid of the highest possible mentality."<sup>51</sup> It may be that such a "placement" within the creative event is exactly what is at work when Christian dream workers relate their encounters with God in dreams and synchronicities.

## **THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF CHRISTIAN DREAM WORKERS: A QUALITATIVE STUDY**

What happens when people meet the "hiddenness" or "dark side" of God? Could meeting God in a way that deconstructs one's God images be a positive move for our communal wellbeing? Taylor points to the surging interest worldwide in dream sharing as symptomatic of our growing communal anxiety and "evolving relationship with the Divine." Myriad factors have historically contributed to a sense of "chaos, uncertainty and increasingly urgent spiritual need," including horrific or sadistic crimes, long-lasting wars, and social unrest and changing demographics. Add an unhealthy contemporary dose of natural disasters and unease about a changing climate, growing ideological tensions, and other "sociocultural markers" of "collective distress and uncertainty," and Taylor finds it unsurprising that interest in "all manner of techniques for 'spiritual renewal and discernment' in general, and in the spiritual implications of dreams and dreaming in particular" are on the rise, especially in a time when "traditional religious practices and institutional leadership" seem less and less relevant.<sup>52</sup> One of the regions witnessing a particular growth in dream-sharing groups is the southeastern part of the United States wherein it was estimated that over 400 dream groups were operating in Christian congregations in 2006.<sup>53</sup> This has been fostered, at least in part, by Hudson's book *Natural*

---

<sup>51</sup> Faber, *God as Poet of the World*, 313–14.

<sup>52</sup> Taylor, "Ambiguities of Privilege," 236–37.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 237.

*Spirituality: Recovering the Wisdom Tradition in Christianity*, and Bob Haden’s establishment of the Haden Institute, both of which integrate Jungian psychology into Christian belief and practice.

In the Spring of 2014, this author conducted an exploratory phenomenological study utilizing a methodology developed in the United Kingdom by Jonathan A. Smith, Paul Flowers, and Michael Larkin called Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)<sup>54</sup> that sought to describe the nature of the shared experience of using Jungian dream work as a Christian spiritual practice. IPA is considered “doubly hermeneutical” because “the researcher is trying to make sense of the participant trying to make sense of what is happening to them.”<sup>55</sup> Considered a “pilot” study, it was not exhaustive and did not seek data saturation, but recruited a small number of Christian dream workers who had registered to attend the Haden Conference in 2014. Data was gathered to answer this primary question: *What is the essential nature and meaning of the practice of Jungian dream work in the spiritual lives of Christians who attend the Haden Conference?* The purpose of the study was to gather rich accounts from a small group of Christian dream workers to gain insight into their own interpretations of their experiences. Moreover, the researcher sought to understand whether participants believed their dreams were a place for encountering God, or had any transforming effect on their spirituality, their theological insights, and their experience of religious community.<sup>56</sup> To counter the potential bias in conducting research as a “participant observer,” the researcher focused on the participants—on *their* accounts, *their* descriptions, and *their* interpretations—during data collection and engaged

---

<sup>54</sup> Jonathan A. Smith, Paul Flowers, and Michael Larkin, *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009), 1.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>56</sup> Five participants were interviewed for 60-90 minutes; they self-identify as Christian, are active in a congregation (with “active” defined as having the status of “member” in the congregation and attending worship at least twice per month), and have been regularly practicing spiritual dream work for at least one year, whether only individually or also within the context of a dream group. Most have attended the Haden conference multiple times.

in deep reflection afterward. Five major themes emerged in data analysis regarding dream work in the lives of these five Christians. Of course, it is impossible to completely isolate the effects of their dream work practice from other aspects of their spiritual and psychological journeys, but what is reported is based on their accounts.<sup>57</sup>

*First, they all made experiential claims of a mystical nature that included feeling God's presence, experiencing an inner knowing, a heightened sense of the reality of a "spiritual realm," energy or *numinosity* in dream images, and sometimes particular physical sensations.*

Susan: I had some negative experience with religious people. Struggled with that. Then in my mid-20s, I had a horrible, horrific family issue come up and thought I would lose my mind. And I had one of those—gosh, I would almost call it a Damascus road type experience. I was talking to my boss, who was also a good friend, about this young man who—well, actually, he had molested my daughter. And I said, 'He needs to get in a church,' and this stuff people say. And he looked at me and he said, "'Do you think it would help you?' And it was like the weirdest thing. It was like this—it was like sitting out on a hot summer day and a cloud goes over the sun...And this cool comes over you. And it was really weird. The whole rest of that day, I went around thinking, even saying—'Everything's going to be okay.' No reason for [that].

Thomas (speaking about his dream group experience): ...and I get a sense now, part of interpreting the language of wetness. Fluid of movement. When that happens the spirit is there and I often see in the dream group—water. Great spiritual sign. And I get that feeling sometimes. When somebody interprets something, I get a flowing feeling when it's right. You know, I'd say, 'mmm.' I get this flowing feeling inside.

June (speaking about her bi-polar son): So it felt like he was just dead and so that was another time where I was just brought to this place of sheer broken nothingness, but God came—God was there.

*Second, they all claimed, in one way or another, that dream work has played a significant role in their spiritual lives, and that dreams themselves hold important meaning and value. All of them have recorded their dreams in writing and analyzed them to one degree or another.*

John: I started off way back in the 80's just writing my dreams down. Sometimes I'd go back and look at them. Then when I hit the skids I started working with my

---

<sup>57</sup> To protect participants' privacy, pseudonyms have been used.

dreams more analytically out of just a survival necessity...over time my dream work became more—I put more energy into it and thought more about it. Then when I hit midlife the dream work became the life preserver that I clung to when all hell broke loose.

Susan: What I would call my greatest gift from the dream work is basically the veil that separates...it's coming down. And I've read somewhere—and I don't know who wrote it—that there are many veils over our consciousness or whatever. Between us and the spiritual realm. And as they come off, you see more clearly and you become more conscious. But I perceive it as a tremendous gift to me. That there is little separation between the waking physical realm and the spiritual realm. And dreams, visions, waking dreams, whatever. They're more and more the same for me. They're carrying as much weight, one as the other. Because they complement one another and they confirm one another. That's the greatest gift.

June: ... it's both cognitive and affective. The 'aha' moments are just incredible... I feel gratitude when I write a dream—a lot of times we just don't remember our dreams and then—but to write down a dream and to look at the richness of it and I think—praying without ceasing. I never would've understood that, but instead of having a prayer time now, my centering prayer time is [dream work].

Third, they interpret their dreams (and often synchronicities) as divine communication that provides insights, guidance, loving support, hope, and healing.

Elizabeth (speaking about how dream work has affected her spiritual life): You know, it's just—I'm conscious of it. I'm really aware that dreams are part of my spirituality. It's like God speaking to me and there's something significant happening in the dreams even, you know, ordinary dreams. And so I'm aware of that.

John (speaking about two dreams where Jesus came to him): It was very clear to me that God was speaking to me and teaching in dreams...Toward the end of my pastoring I have to say that my morning dream work became my primary spiritual discipline. That was the way that I felt God was communicating with me most clearly.

Susan: And I used to—I'd work a dream to exhaustion. And I finally came to realize that if it's something I need, it's going to come. And I started seeing a pattern where [God] would use an entirely different dream to reflect on the same issue...Very often dreams came to me as confirmation on things. And then too it's just become so much a part of my connection to the Divine. Just His presence, you know?

*Fourth, they saw their dream work as an enriching and transformative practice in relation to their experience of self.* It typically helped to increase their sense of self-acceptance, self-knowledge, and self-forgiveness; they described themselves as happier, healthier, more integrated and more whole as a result of this practice.

June: (speaking about dreaming and sleep) So you're letting go of control, conscious thought, and that's when the real person, good, bad [emerges]...so I think—I don't feel as guilty and I don't really feel shame anymore about who I am. For some reason, every time I messed up somehow or things didn't go the way society said they should, I felt a sense of shame, but I don't really much feel that anymore.

Elizabeth: (again speaking of how dream work has affected her spiritual life) I think it's broadened it; my life is more enriched because of it. I bring a lot more to it, you know, like I'm a lot more aware that my life is filled with all kinds of prayer practices and sometimes when I'm developing prayers, they don't look very Catholic any more. They tend to look more pagan because I'm looking for symbols that speak, that are rich, kind of like, you know, as they would come to us in dreams...

Susan: (who credits dream work with helping her survive a battle with cancer over the previous year) I feel whole. And I know there's more. But yeah. People tell me how radiant—I hear it constantly...And at first I thought, well, they're just trying to make me feel better because I'm not looking as sick. Because I looked like death for many months. But it's like—it got to be so constant. I would see people in WalMart—'You're so radiant.' That word, constant, 'radiant.' Radiant, radiant, radiant. There must be something to it. And it's more than my shiny make-up. And I feel that.

*Lastly, they saw their dream work as an enriching and transformative practice regarding their relationships with God and others.* They feel it helped to broaden their spiritual perspectives, change their images of God, deepen their friendships, heal past hurts, and increase their appreciation of, or participation in, other religious traditions.

Thomas: (speaking about a dream he had) I had one particularly dark time where I remember myself falling down in blackness and then reaching a point where I felt a hand under my rib cage and that stopped the fall...I knew there was a bottom and that somebody was there observing and caring.

Thomas was then asked what had changed for him after that experience, and he said,

...Like, it wasn't so dark and I knew if I kept on putting one foot ahead of the other I would get through. That there was an invisible means of support... After that hand on the rib cage I saw [God] was not only real, but he was for me. And then with [the dreams of] my parents, I could see that this is bigger than anything I ever imaged. [God's] really there.

Elizabeth: ...just more recently I've started noticing—like after a dream group session I might pick up on the same symbols as another person. That's just kind of a recent thing. Like, oh, that's interesting for my own dreams. And then whenever I promote dream work I talk about it in terms of that it's not just a personal thing. But it's, you know, we help to heal society and to contribute to healing our shadow stuff so that we're not projecting so much and that, you know, the world is a better place if we participate in dream work and get to know our shadows better.

Susan: So I don't know how much longer I have. I know this particular cancer, if it returns, it returns quickly and ferociously. And I believe that I'm well. I think that all is well. But what a glorious thing to have arrived where I am before it's all over. Because that was one thing with me. It was like, okay, life is painful. And I know it's a growth thing from start to finish. But shouldn't you be able to arrive somewhere, you know? And I would like to—right at this moment, I really like where I'm at. And I know there's more. But I'm just really grateful. *Grateful*. I feel like the Beloved. Finally.

Bulkeley acknowledges that dream interpretation “may seem more trouble than it is worth” for pastoral counselors because they can be dismissed as mere “wish fulfillment” or even as satanic, on the one hand, or, on the other, naively elevated to the status of “instant enlightenment.”<sup>58</sup> Yet he offers a very helpful perspective when he writes that,

Dream interpretation has several valuable roles to play in pastoral care and counseling. Powerful and often frightening dreams are commonly experienced whenever a person is going through a time of major life change, crisis, or conflict. By paying close attention to dreams during such times, important insights can be gained into the person's fears, as well as his or her highest hopes and greatest strengths. More generally, some dreams are in and of themselves spiritually transformative experiences.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>58</sup> Kelly Bulkeley, “Dream Interpretation: Practical Methods for Pastoral Care and Counseling,” *Pastoral Psychology* 49, no. 2 (2000): 95–96.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 95.

The participants interviewed in this project would most likely agree. At the end of June's interview, she was asked to summarize how dream work has impacted her spiritual life.

The one word that comes to mind is connection. I feel *connected* to my inner self; most days, not all the time. I feel connected to who I really am and I feel connected to the life force...the poem 'Desiderata' used to make me cry, you know, 'you're a child of the universe'. And I never knew why it made me cry—because it's really kind of corny, but now it's not corny to me at all and I just feel like dream work cuts across the entire universe. It feels to me as though it opens us up or has opened me up to forces that I don't really have to understand, but that there is guidance—loving guidance—and that's what I think.

For those who resist the use of subjective accounts and interpretations of dreams for meaningful research, Bulkeley points out that “dreams can be reliably remembered and reported,” and quotes neuroscientist Antonio Damasio's opposition to those who are extremely skeptical of the value of “introspective reports...‘Whether one likes it or not, *all* the contents in our minds are subjective, and the power of science comes from its ability to verify objectively the consistency of many individual subjectivities.’”<sup>60</sup> We might also keep in mind that a scientist cannot objectively *prove* that she loves her husband, nor can patients who fill out pain scales objectively *prove* the level of their pain, yet such subjective accounts are widely accepted. Though investigators cannot be sure that people may not misrepresent their experiences, Bulkeley argues that

we should be careful not to let this concern lead to a complete rejection of all personal, introspective data. That would surely be an overreaction. Excessive skepticism can too easily become a kind of quasi-autistic inability to accept that other people really do have minds and subjective experiences of their own.<sup>61</sup>

At this stage of our knowledge, it is certainly impossible to completely pin down the nature of the dream experience. Jung himself remained somewhat mystified about its nature, writing,

I do not know where else to go [other than to dreams] for help, and so I try to find it in dreams; these at least present us with images pointing to something or other,

---

<sup>60</sup> Bulkeley, *Big Dreams*, 78.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.



and that is at any rate better than nothing. I have no theory about dreams; I do not know how dreams arise. I am altogether in doubt as to whether my way of handling dreams even deserves the name of 'method.' I share all my readers' prejudices against dream interpretation as being the quintessence of uncertainty and arbitrariness. But, on the other hand, I know that if we meditate on a dream sufficiently long and thoroughly—if we take it about with us and turn it over and over—something almost always comes of it.<sup>62</sup>

Additional qualitative studies of this emerging movement in Christian spirituality is called for and can broaden the scholarship regarding transformative practice, new religious movements, and offer a rich area of interdisciplinary potential between the fields of theology, religious studies, contemplative spirituality, psychology, and practical theology and spiritual formation. Moreover, if using a practice of dream work within a Christian context has a positive impact on people's lives, and if such a practice helps them to become aware of the transformative presence of God in the "small spaces" of their lives, then teaching and encouraging such a practice in congregations should be a vital ministry of the church—possibly even one of its core ministries. Such a ministry has the potential to be enlivening and revitalizing not only for currently active churchgoers but also for those who have become disengaged with congregational life, as well as for those with no religious affiliation who are seeking to deepen their spiritual lives.

## SUMMARY

In Chapters 4 and 5, we examined the role that dream work plays in Jung's analytical psychology as well as how it might be viewed from scientific, communal, and mystical viewpoints. Yet we saw each viewpoint is limited by obstacles to greater adoption mostly due to the lack of a metaphysical-theoretical framework within which dreams and dream work could be

---

<sup>62</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 62.

understood as revealing something crucial about the very nature of reality. In Chapter 6 I showed how a synthesis of Whitehead and Jung laid the foundation for generative constructive work. In this chapter, I have shown how the constructed *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming* combined with awareness of a *relational-imaginal God-Self* within allows us to see spiritual dream work as a *transformative relational-imaginal praxis* in which we can engage to (1) improve our conscious transmutation, (2) raise unconscious propositions to intellectual feelings, and, (3) discern—and better conform to—God’s initial aims. Moreover, I have described wholeness and flourishing as ultimately being marked by increased enjoyment and intensity of experience achieved through being able to respond consciously and creatively to life as it is in the present moment. I have therefore shown dream work to be a transformative *relational-imaginal praxis for psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing*.

## CONCLUSION

No piece of reality is excluded from being a bearer of the holy.

—Paul Tillich

Our bodies, including our brains, body proper and all the interconnected systems that make us ‘us’ are designed to take care of us, and facilitate all the wonder that the human experience can give us. Our bodies are all-inclusive systems that allow us to think, feel, interpret, receive and perceive the universe we live in. They define for us what it means to be humanly alive. Even spiritual or mystical experience is facilitated through our human bodies. Life is truly an embodied phenomenon.

—Alane Daugherty, *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness*

I want a religion that will promote the living experience, fraught as it is with anxiety and the unknown, over the dead certainty of a religion that offers no opportunity for personal growth and transformation. When we accept a living reality, we give ourselves a greater degree of freedom to keep the sacraments alive, even if it means changing the theology.

—Pittman J. McGehee, *The Invisible Church*

We have spun here a relational-imaginal web of theory and practice: of Whitehead, Jung, and dream work. We have explored likely reasons for our divided and divisive culture. We have envisioned integrative theoretical, empirical, and practical resources to address our fragmentation. We have witnessed signposts for transpersonal reality, unconscious perception, vision, value, novelty, and change. We have imagined a cosmos and psyche where everything formed is formed in relation to everything else. We have sounded the depths of reality and found at its heart deep feeling, aesthetic value, imagination and image. We come now to the proverbial “so what?” question. What is the ultimate value of a *relational-imaginal theory of dreaming*, or of a theory of a *relational-imaginal God-Self* in the human being, or of a *relational-imaginal praxis* in the greater scheme of things? After this long, interdisciplinary weaving project, I must return to my social location as one who claims a pluralistic, ecofeministic, and panentheistic

Christian identity. Because of that identity, I first claim the value of such a relational-imaginal web of theory and practice as *Christian*—as reflecting the good news of Jesus the Christ, and therefore as robust and liberative for Christians. But then, like one who takes a step onto the spiral pathway back out from the center of the labyrinth, I also claim this relational-imaginal web to be *transreligious*—as offering value, belonging, and transformation for any who seek psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing.

In his *Lure of Divine Love*, W. Norman Pittenger called for a “radical reconception of the Christian tradition in which we stand and from which we look at things,” asking us to “work through once more, the things that are both human and Christian.”<sup>63</sup> Christians have for millennia described the human condition as one of both sin and grace—although it can be argued that the Church has more often focused on the sin. Beldon Lane, in his beautiful and evocative writing on Calvinist spirituality and its core aspect of desire, notes Calvin’s “extravagant” description of the “radical unity of nature and God” as counterbalanced by a pessimism regarding humans’ capacity to “choose and follow what attracts them most” because “they languish in a broken disjointedness that echoes through the entire created order.”<sup>64</sup> Yet maybe Morton Kelsey is correct that humans exist more in the “condition of the wanderer” than in one of “hovering in fear and anxiety over the abyss of nothingness”; as wanderers, we humans possess a “compass” that helps us “sense” the direction we must go if we “hearken to revelation.”<sup>65</sup> In Kelsey’s description, each human “is a pilgrim to the absolute. And the absolute is not an earthly possession but a mission.”<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 192.

<sup>64</sup> Beldon C. Lane, “Spirituality as the Performance of Desire: Calvin on the World as a Theatre of God’s Glory,” *Spiritus* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2001): 7–11.

<sup>65</sup> Kelsey, *Encounter With God*, 97.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*

The mission of the Christian community, like all that are built around revelation and revelatory experience, is to communicate—and *live out*—its “good news” in a way that is meaningful. No matter how “startling” or “original” a revelatory vision is, Rosemary Radford Ruether insists that it still “must always be communicated and made meaningful through some transformation of ideas and symbols already current.”<sup>67</sup> While Athanasius and Leo I claim to be true to tradition, Ruether insists they “are in fact engaged in a constant process of revision of the symbolic pattern in a way that reflects their experience.” If Ruether is correct that the only way a “religious pattern” can remain “vital” is if the symbols used to communicate it are alive and “speak to individuals in the community and provide for them the redemptive meaning of individual and collective experience,”<sup>68</sup> then, based on the evident decline of participation in Christian churches, the symbols used to communicate the Christian revelation seem no longer vital or effective.

Hosinski is deeply correct when he notes that the Trinitarian and Christological doctrines of the Church that attempted to describe the presence of God in the human Jesus were written using substance-based “metaphysical concepts available in the fourth and fifth centuries.”<sup>69</sup> Such concepts are no longer sufficient or meaningful to do the work required today. I have shown in this project through the synthesis of Whiteheadian and Jungian theory and empiricism with a practice of spiritual dream work, that a relational-imaginal understanding of the presence of God in each entity, of our inherent relationality with God and the entire cosmos, of our thrust toward value and the purposiveness of human life, and of the accessibility of real, positive transformation through alignment with God’s desires and possibilities is robust and liberative.

---

<sup>67</sup> Rosemary R. Ruether, *Sexism and God Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1993), 14.

<sup>68</sup> *Ibid.*, 15–16.

<sup>69</sup> Hosinski, *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*, 243.

This view is robust and liberative for Christians because the relational-imaginal practical theology expressed herein is “faithful to the heart of Christian revelation”<sup>70</sup>; as much so in this time and place as earlier articulations were in their own times and places. Yet the final proof of this claim lies in the pudding of experience. “Theology,” Jung claims, “demands faith, and faith cannot be made: it is in the truest sense a gift of grace.”<sup>71</sup> Faith arises from experience, from relationship with the living God. The “life of the spirit,” when experienced anew for ourselves, is, Jung writes, “the only way in which we can break the spell that binds us to the cycle of biological events.”<sup>72</sup> Such faith in the constantly fluid “life of the spirit” is a commitment to align oneself with ultimate reality whether that reality conforms to one’s previously held beliefs or not. Such faith is renewed by the healing and wholeness experienced when one’s heart is opened to God’s transformative power and presence. This is a Christian message, but it is also more expansive and inclusive than that.

Even while the relational-imaginal web of theory and practice advocated in this work can be distinctly Christian, I strongly believe that this is also a humanist and therefore *transreligious* project. If to be human is to dream, then this is a universal and transpersonal truth, even if those dreams are not easily recalled for every individual. If the cosmos itself is, at its very core, relational, value-soaked, and transformative, then all humans—regardless of location— inherently have the capacity to participate in and experience those qualities. Drawing from Pittenger and Ogden, the relational-imaginal web woven herein better “re-presents” what “God is always and everywhere up to, what God is always and everywhere doing, and what God is always and everywhere seeking to achieve in the world—with which God is unfailingly related

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 244.

<sup>71</sup> Jung, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, 122.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

and with which God is in a relationship of mutual influence.”<sup>73</sup> If this relational-imaginal web represents what God is doing everywhere and all the time, then it need not be limited to any one religious tradition or even to religion itself. It is what Joyce Rockwood Hudson refers to as a “natural spirituality”<sup>74</sup> or what Roland Faber might call a *process spirituality*. In Faber’s “spiritual vision” for the Center for Process Studies he describes process spirituality as being about “experience.”

A process spirituality is about ‘organic’ life and (to live within) its experience. Whitehead’s understanding of the universe allows for a spirituality of interconnection through empathy, through which we are enabled to ‘feel’ everything, and to feel everything differently. We begin to ‘experience’ flux, relatedness, transformation, and ‘permanence,’ or should we better say: the ‘persistance’ of the creative Eros in all. We know of the tragic complexities of such feelings but we might become able to search for their meaning differently: we seek ecological, social, and religious peace.<sup>75</sup>

There are many who run for the hills any time the word “religion” comes up, yet is such a knee-jerk response more because of the “wooden” meaning of religion that “has prevailed in institutional churches and in conventional religious communities” rather than the potential for religion to be “a matter of imaginative and aesthetic response to the human situation and to whatever is supremely worshipful in the cosmos—that is, to what religion calls ‘God’?”<sup>76</sup> Returning to Jung’s idea that a “religious outlook” means the sense that there is a wholeness to the world that then facilitates wholeness in each individual<sup>77</sup> and Pittenger’s view that religion is “largely a matter of deeply felt relationships, or response to beauty...a matter of profound imagination...[an] inescapable and indestructible manifestation of the human spirit,” may we not embrace a relational-imaginal web of theory and practice as religious in this transreligious sense?

---

<sup>73</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 65.

<sup>74</sup> Hudson, *Natural Spirituality*, passim.

<sup>75</sup> Roland Faber, “‘...adventure of the Spirit...’: My Vision for the Center for Process Studies,” *Process Perspectives*, no. Summer (2006): 11.

<sup>76</sup> Pittenger, *The Lure of Divine Love*, 51.

<sup>77</sup> Kalsched, *Trauma and the Soul*, 169.

I believe that we can and we must because the theological and psycho-spiritual perspective articulated herein is one pathway toward healing the alienation and fragmentation that currently plagues our culture and our culture *will no longer welcome* a solely Christian message.

Based on the only-surface-scratching symptoms and realities described in Chapter 1, I agree with Bernard Loomer that, for all intents and purposes, American culture has failed,<sup>78</sup> especially regarding the overall wholeness and flourishing of both people and planet. As a conglomerate, the American people are not whole; we are not “at home” in our bodies or at peace in our minds and spirits; we do not “know our center to be a larger stream of life transcending the ego and going on beyond our death” that is somehow still “in union with” the individual soul.<sup>79</sup> Loomer’s answer to the failure of an American ethos rooted in a flawed individualistic, dualistic, and mechanistic worldview was *aesthetic* and based on what he called “stature” or “size.”

By size I mean the stature of a person’s soul, the range and depth of his love, his capacity for relationships. I mean the volume of life you can take into your being and still maintain your integrity and individuality, the intensity and variety of outlook you can entertain in the unity of your being without feeling defensive or insecure. I mean the strength of your spirit to encourage others to become freer in the development of their diversity and uniqueness.<sup>80</sup>

As with Loomer’s emphasis on *size*, my emphasis on psycho-spiritual wholeness and flourishing leans more toward the “size-producing capacities” than the “justice-producing capacities of society” because I agree that “justice pursued in our present statureless society will probably do no more than give the once-downtrodden their opportunity to be truly dehumanized, insensitive, and materialistic, the way the elites of today are.”<sup>81</sup> Life is wounding, and wounded people

---

<sup>78</sup> Dean, “Introduction: From Size to Integrity,” 9.

<sup>79</sup> Kearney, “Healing the Soul in a Culture of Fear,” 42.

<sup>80</sup> Bernard M. Loomer, “S-I-Z-E Is the Measure,” in *Religious Experience and Process Theology: The Pastoral Implications of a Major Modern Movement*, ed. Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee (New York: Paulist Press, 1976), 70.

<sup>81</sup> Dean, “Introduction: From Size to Integrity,” 9.



wound: there is no avoiding that reality, no matter how religious one is or is not. But this wounding reality—where everything is in flux and everything perishes—is also healing; brimming with grace and with a fluid, transpersonal, and creative reality that we can call “God” and in whose wholeness we can be made more whole, more loving, more beautiful. In this wounding *and* whole-making reality—no matter how many categories of adverse childhood experience you lived through, no matter how divisive your politics, no matter how lonely or addicted your life is, no matter how fragmented and alienated we all are—we *matter*, we *belong*, and we can be *transformed*.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adelson, Rachel. "Stimulating the Vagus Nerve: Memories Are Made of This." *American Psychological Association*, April 2004. <http://www.apa.org/monitor/apr04/vagus.aspx>.
- "Adverse Childhood Experience Study (ACES)." *Advokids: A Legal Resource for California Foster Children and Their Advocates*. Accessed September 16, 2016. <http://www.advokids.org/adverse-childhood-experience-study-aces/>.
- Aizenstat, Stephen. *Dream Tending: Awakening to the Healing Power of Dreams*. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2011.
- . "Jungian Psychology and the World Unconscious." In *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind*, edited by Theodore Roszak, Mary E. Gomes, and Allen D. Kanner. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1995.
- Anderson, Ray S. *The Shape of Practical Theology: Empowering Ministry with Theological Praxis*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2001.
- Argyle, Michael. *Psychology and Religion: An Introduction*. London, New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Arlow, Jacob A. *Legacy of Sigmund Freud*. New York: International Universities Press, Inc., 1956.
- Ball, Philip. "Photosynthesis Works by 'Quantum Computing.'" *Chemistry World*, May 1, 2007. <https://www.chemistryworld.com/news/photosynthesis-works-by-quantum-computing/1013803.article>.
- Ballard, Edward G. "Kant and Whitehead, and the Philosophy of Mathematics." In *Studies in Whitehead's Philosophy*, 10:3–29. Tulane Studies in Philosophy. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1961.
- Bergland, Christopher. "How Does the Vagus Nerve Convey Gut Instincts to the Brain?" *Psychology Today*, May 23, 2014. <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-athletes-way/201405/how-does-the-vagus-nerve-convey-gut-instincts-the-brain>.
- Bosnak, Robert. "The Physician Inside." In *Imagination and Medicine*, edited by Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak, xv–xxiv. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009.
- Bowman, Donna, and Jay McDaniel, eds. *Handbook of Process Theology*. Annotated edition. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006.
- Boyd-MacMillan, Eolene. "Loder and Mystical Spirituality: Particularity, Universality, and Intelligence." In *Redemptive Transformation in Practical Theology: Essays in Honor of James E. Loder Jr.*, edited by Dana R. Wright and John D. Kuentzel. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.

- Bracken, Joseph A. *The Divine Matrix: Creativity As Link Between East and West*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.
- . *The One in the Many: A Contemporary Reconstruction of the God-World Relationship*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2001.
- Brinkley, Alan, B. “Whitehead on Symbolic Reference.” In *Studies in Whitehead’s Philosophy*, 10:31–45. Tulane Studies in Philosophy. New Orleans: Tulane University, 1961.
- Bulkeley, Kelly. *An Introduction to the Psychology of Dreaming*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997.
- . *Big Dreams: The Science of Dreaming and the Origins of Religion*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- . “Dream Interpretation: Practical Methods for Pastoral Care and Counseling.” *Pastoral Psychology* 49, no. 2 (2000): 95–104.
- . “Dream-Sharing Groups, Spirituality, and Community.” *Journal of Religion and Health* 35, no. 1 (Spring 1996): 59–66.
- . *Visions of the Night: Dreams, Religion and Psychology*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1999.
- Burkhart, Ford. “Edward F. Edinger, 75, Analyst And Writer on Jung’s Concepts.” *The New York Times*, August 2, 1998. <http://www.nytimes.com/1998/08/02/us/edward-f-edinger-75-analyst-and-writer-on-jung-s-concepts.html>.
- Card, Charles R. “The Archetypal View of C.G. Jung and Wolfgang Pauli.” *Psychological Perspectives* 24, no. Spring-Summer 1991 (1991): 23–33.
- Chalquist, Craig. “Who Was Carl Jung and Why Should We Study Him and His Work?” Accessed November 25, 2016. <http://www.pacificapost.com/who-was-carl-jung-and-why-should-we-study-him-and-his-work>.
- Christ, C. *She Who Changes: Re-Imagining the Divine in the World*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Christ, Carol P., and Judith Plaskow. *Goddess and God in the World: Conversations in Embodied Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016.
- Cirlot, Juan Eduardo. *A Dictionary of Symbols*. Mineola, NY: Dover Publications, 2002.
- Clark, Walter Houston. “The Psychology of Religious Experience.” In *Current Perspectives in the Psychology of Religion*, edited by H. Newton Malony, 227–37. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.
- Clayton, Philip. *Mind and Emergence: From Quantum to Consciousness*. Oxford University Press, 2006.

- Clayton, Philip, and Simpson Zachary. *Adventures in the Spirit: God, World, Divine Action*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Cobb Jr., John B. "Eternal Objects and Archetypes: A Response to Stanley Hopper." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 1–76. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- . *God and the World*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1969.
- . "Spiritual Discernment in a Whiteheadian Perspective." In *Religious Experience and Process Theology: The Pastoral Implications of a Major Modern Movement*, edited by Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- . "Wholeness Centered in Spirit." In *Spirit-Centered Wholeness: Beyond the Psychology of Self*, edited by H. Newton Malony, Michele Papen-Daniels, and Howard Clinebell. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- Cobb Jr., John B., and David Ray Griffin. *Process Theology*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1976.
- Coleman, Monica A. "An Exchange of Gifts: Process and Womanist Theologies." In *Handbook of Process Theology*, 160–76. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006.
- . *Making a Way Out of No Way: A Womanist Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2008.
- Coward, Harold. "Taoism and Jung: Synchronicity and the Self." *Philosophy East and West* 46, no. 4 (1996): 477–95. doi:10.2307/1399493.
- Crouse, Janice Shaw. "The Loneliness of American Society." *The American Spectator*, May 18, 2014. [http://spectator.org/59230\\_loneliness-american-society/](http://spectator.org/59230_loneliness-american-society/).
- Daugherty, Alane. *From Mindfulness to Heartfulness: A Journey of Transformation through the Science of Embodiment*. Bloomington, IN: Balboa Press, 2014.
- Davis, Timothy L., and Clara E. Hill. "Spiritual and Nonspiritual Approaches to Dream Work: Effects on Clients' Well-Being." *Journal of Counseling & Development* 83, no. Fall 2005 (Fall 2005): 492–503.
- Dean, William D. "Introduction: From Size to Integrity." In *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, edited by William D. Dean and Larry E. Axel. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Dourley, John P. *The Psyche As Sacrament: A Comparative Study of C.G. Jung and Paul Tillich*. Toronto: Inner City Books, 1981.
- Dowd, Michael. "Is Biblicist Christianity Bankrupt?" *Evolutionary Christianity*, n.d. <http://evolutionarychristianity.com/blog/general/is-biblicist-christianity-bankrupt/>.

- Dreitzer, Andrew. "Lecture Notes on 'Spirituality and Spirituality Studies.'" Claremont School of Theology, Fall 2012.
- Edinger, Edward F. *Ego and Archetype: Individuation and the Religious Function of the Psyche*. Boston; London: Shambhala, 1992.
- Epperly, Bruce G. "Process Theology and the Healing Adventure: Reflections on Spirituality and Medicine." In *Handbook of Process Theology*, edited by Donna Bowman and Jay McDaniel. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006.
- Faber, Roland. "'...adventure of the Spirit...': My Vision for the Center for Process Studies." *Process Perspectives*, no. Summer (2006): 11–12.
- . *God as Poet of the World: Exploring Process Theologies*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Fang, Jiliang, Peijing Rong, Yang Hong, Yangyang Fan, Jun Liu, Honghong Wang, Guolei Zhang, et al. "Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation Modulates Default Mode Network in Major Depressive Disorder." *Biological Psychiatry* 79, no. 4 (February 15, 2016): 266–73. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2015.03.025.
- Felitti, Vincent J., and Robert F. Anda. "The Relationship of Adverse Childhood Experiences to Adult Medical Disease, Psychiatric Disorders and Sexual Behavior: Implications for Healthcare." In *The Impact of Early Life Trauma on Health and Disease: The Hidden Epidemic*, edited by Ruth A. Lanius, Eric Vermetten, and Clare Pain, 77–87. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Franz, Marie-Louise von. "Conclusion: Science and the Unconscious." In *Man and His Symbols*, edited by C. G. Jung. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*. Translated by A. A. Brill. New York: Modern Library, 1995.
- Frey-Rohn, Liliane. *From Freud to Jung: A Comparative Study of the Psychology of the Unconscious*. Boston: Shambhala, 2001.
- Goehler, Lisa E. "Vagal Complexity: Substrate for Body-Mind Connections?" *Bratislavske Lekarske Listy* 107, no. 8 (2006): 275–76.
- Goldenberg, Naomi R. "Archetypal Theory and the Separation of Mind and Body: Reason Enough to Turn to Freud?" *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 1, no. 1 (Spring 1985): 55–72.
- . "Jung After Feminism." In *Beyond Androcentrism: New Essays on Women and Religion*, edited by Rita M Gross. American Academy of Religion Aids for the Study of Religion. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for the American Academy of Religion, 1977.

- Griffin, David Ray. "A Metaphysical Psychology to Un-Lock Our Ailing World." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 239–49. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- . *A Process Christology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1973.
- . "Holy Spirit: Compassion and Reverence for Being." In *Religious Experience and Process Theology*, edited by Bernard Cargas and Harry J. Lee. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- . "Introduction, Archetypal Psychology and Process Philosophy: Complementary Postmodern Movements." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 1–76. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- , ed. *The Archetypal Process*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- Halligan, Fredrica R. "Jungian Theory and Religious Experience." In *Handbook of Religious Experience*, edited by Ralph W. Hood. Birmingham, AL: Religious Education Press, 1995.
- Hartmann, Ernest. *The Nature and Functions of Dreaming*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Haule, John. "Personal Secrets, Ethical Questions." In *Teaching Jung*, edited by Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, 151–68. AAR Teaching Religious Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Heisig, James W. "The Mystique of the Nonrational and a New Spirituality." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 167–202. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- Hillman, James. "Back to Beyond: On Cosmology." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 129–32. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- . "Forward." In *Ecopsychology: Restoring the Earth, Healing the Mind*, edited by Theodore Roszak, Mary E. Gomes, and Allen D. Kanner. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1995.
- Hood, Ralph W. "Mystical, Spiritual, and Religious Experiences." In *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, edited by Raymond F. Paloutzian and Crystal L. Park, 348–64. New York: The Guilford Press, 2005.
- Hopper, Stanley R. "Language as Metaphorical: A Reply to John Cobb." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 129–32. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.

- . “Once More: The Cavern beneath the Cave.” In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 107–24. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- Hosinski, Thomas E. *Stubborn Fact and Creative Advance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1993.
- Hoss, Robert J. “Evidence of a Cognitive Function within Dreams.” [www.dreamscience.org](http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/Cognitive_Function_Dreaming-Hoss.pdf), July 2010. [http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/Cognitive\\_Function\\_Dreaming-Hoss.pdf](http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/Cognitive_Function_Dreaming-Hoss.pdf).
- . “Evidence of Wisdom in Dreams.” Asheville, NC, 2010.
- . “Image Activation Dreamwork.” Accessed December 17, 2016. [http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/image\\_activation\\_dreamwork.htm](http://www.dreamscience.org/articles/image_activation_dreamwork.htm).
- . “Recent Neurological Studies Supportive of Jung’s Theories on Dreaming.” Berkeley, CA, 2012.
- Hudson, Joyce Rockwood. *Natural Spirituality: Recovering the Wisdom Tradition in Christianity*. 2nd ed. Danielsville, GA: JRH Publications, 2001.
- Huffaker, Lucinda A. “Feminist Theology in Process Perspective.” In *Handbook of Process Theology*, edited by Donna Bowman and Jay McDaniel, Annotated. St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2006.
- Johnson, A. H. *Whitehead’s Theory of Reality*. New York: Dover Publications, 1962.
- Johnson, Robert A. *Inner Work: Using Dreams and Active Imagination for Personal Growth*. San Francisco: HarperOne, 1989.
- Jung, C. G. *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Harvest, 1955.
- . *Psychology and Religion: West and East*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Corrected. Vol. 11. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series. New York: Pantheon Books, 1963.
- . *The Basic Writings of C. G. Jung*. Edited by Violet Staub De Laszlo. Reprint. New York: Modern Library, 1993.
- . *The Portable Jung*. Edited by Joseph Campbell. New York: Viking Press, 1971.
- . *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*. Translated by R.F.C. Hull. Corrected. Vol. 8. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.
- . *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology*. Translated by R. F. C. Hull. Vol. 7. The Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Bollingen Series. New York: Pantheon Books, 1953.

- Kalsched, Donald. *Trauma and the Soul: A Psycho-Spiritual Approach to Human Development and Its Interruption*. London, New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Kearney, Michael. "Healing the Soul in a Culture of Fear." In *Imagination and Medicine*, edited by Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak, 35–44. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009.
- Keller, Catherine E. "Psychocosmetics and the Underworld Connection." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 133–56. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- . "Self and God: Separation, Sexism, and Self." In *Creating Womens Theology: A Movement Engaging Process Thought*, edited by Monica A. Coleman, Nancy R. Howell, and Helene Tallon Russell. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- . *The Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming*. London, New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Kelsey, Morton T. *Dreams: A Way to Listen to God*. New York: Paulist Press, 1978.
- . *Encounter With God: A Theology of Christian Experience*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- . *God, Dreams, and Revelation: A Christian Interpretation of Dreams*. Revised and Expanded. Augsburg Books, 1991.
- Kim, Chae Young. "A Comparison of Alfred North Whitehead's and Carl Gustav Jung's Idea of Religion: Special Reference to Their Lectures on Religion." *Journal of Dharma* 27, no. 3 (July 1, 2002): 417–28.
- Kirkpatrick, Lee A. "Evolutionary Psychology: An Emerging New Foundation for the Psychology of Religion." In *Handbook of the Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, edited by Raymond F. Paloutzian and Crystal L. Park, 101–19. New York: The Guilford Press, 2005.
- Klarer, Melanie, Myrtha Arnold, Lydia Günther, Christine Winter, Wolfgang Langhans, and Urs Meyer. "Gut Vagal Afferents Differentially Modulate Innate Anxiety and Learned Fear." *The Journal of Neuroscience: The Official Journal of the Society for Neuroscience* 34, no. 21 (May 21, 2014): 7067–76. doi:10.1523/JNEUROSCI.0252-14.2014.
- Kradin, Richard. "Reply to Bessel van Der Kolk." In *Imagination and Medicine*, edited by Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak, 189–95. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009.
- Kraus, Elizabeth M. *The Metaphysics of Experience: A Companion to Whitehead's Process and Reality*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1979.
- Kripal, Jeffrey J. "Visions of the Impossible." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 31, 2014. <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Embrace-the-Unexplained/145557/>.



- Lane, Beldon C. "Spirituality as the Performance of Desire: Calvin on the World as a Theatre of God's Glory." *Spiritus* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2001).
- Lauter, Estella, and Carol Schreier Rupprecht. "Feminist Archetypal Theory: A Proposal." In *Feminist Archetypal Theory: Interdisciplinary Re-Visions of Jungian Thought*, edited by Estella Lauter and Carol Scheier Rupprecht. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985.
- Lee, Bernard J. *The Becoming of the Church: A Process Theology of the Structures of Christian Experience*. New York: Paulist Press, 1974.
- Liu, Jun, Jiliang Fang, Zengjian Wang, Peijing Rong, Yang Hong, Yangyang Fan, Xiaoling Wang, et al. "Transcutaneous Vagus Nerve Stimulation Modulates Amygdala Functional Connectivity in Patients with Depression." *Journal of Affective Disorders* 205 (November 15, 2016): 319–26. doi:10.1016/j.jad.2016.08.003.
- Loomer, Bernard M. "S-I-Z-E Is the Measure." In *Religious Experience and Process Theology: The Pastoral Implications of a Major Modern Movement*, edited by Harry J. Cargas and Bernard Lee, 69–76. New York: Paulist Press, 1976.
- . "The Size of God." In *The Size of God: The Theology of Bernard Loomer in Context*, edited by William D. Dean and Larry E. Axel. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1987.
- Mattingly, Susan Shotliff. "Whitehead's Theory of Eternal Objects." PhD, University of Texas at Austin, 1968.
- Maxwell, Grant. "Archetype and Eternal Object: Jung, Whitehead, and the Return of Formal Causation." *Archai: The Journal of Archetypal Cosmology* 3 (Winter 2011): 51–71.
- McGehee, J. Pittman, and Damon J. Thomas. *The Invisible Church: Finding Spirituality Where You Are*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2008.
- McTaggart, Lynne. "Quantum Plants." Accessed October 1, 2016. <http://www.lynnemctaggart.com/blog/375-hello>.
- Mersbergen, Miriam van. "Viva La Vagus!" *Choral Journal* 55, no. 3 (October 2014): 67–73.
- Mesle, C. Robert. *Process-Relational Philosophy: An Introduction to Alfred North Whitehead*. West Conshohocken, PA: Templeton Press, 2008.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. *God in Creation: A New Theology of Creation and the Spirit of God*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Monbiot, George. "Neoliberalism Is Creating Loneliness. That's What's Wrenching Society Apart." *The Guardian*, October 12, 2016. [https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/12/neoliberalism-creating-loneliness-wrenching-society-apart?CMP=share\\_btn\\_fb](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/12/neoliberalism-creating-loneliness-wrenching-society-apart?CMP=share_btn_fb).

- Moore, Robert L. "Psychocosmetics: A Jungian Response." In *The Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 133–56. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- Murray, Leslie A. *An Introduction to the Process Understanding of Science, Society and the Self: A Philosophy for Modern Humanity*. Vol. 26. Symposium Series. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.
- Nelson, Geoff. *Dreaming in Church: Dream Work as a Spiritual Practice for Christians*. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2016.
- Nicolaus, Georg. *C.G. Jung and Nikolai Berdyaev: Individuation and the Person: A Critical Comparison*. London, New York: Routledge, 2010.
- Odin, Steve. *Process Metaphysics and Hua-Yen Buddhism: A Critical Study of Cumulative Penetration vs. Interpenetration*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1982.
- Pagels, Elaine. *The Gnostic Gospels*. Reissue. New York: Vintage, 1989.
- Palmer, Parker J. "The Gift of Presence, The Perils of Advice." *On Being*, April 27, 2016. <http://www.onbeing.org/blog/parker-palmer-the-gift-of-presence-the-perils-of-advice/8628>.
- Pargament, Kenneth I. *Spiritually Integrated Psychotherapy: Understanding and Addressing the Sacred*. New York: The Guilford Press, 2011.
- Perera, Sylvia Brinton. "The Descent of Inanna: Myth and Therapy." In *Feminist Archetypal Theory: Interdisciplinary Re-Visions of Jungian Thought*, edited by Estella Lauter and Carol Scheier Rupprecht. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1985.
- Perrin, David B. *Studying Christian Spirituality*. New York: Routledge, 2007.
- Pittenger, W. Norman. *The Lure of Divine Love: Human Experience and Christian Faith in a Process Perspective*. New York: Pilgrim Press, 1979.
- Poplin, Mary, and Dallas Willard. *Is Reality Secular?: Testing the Assumptions of Four Global Worldviews*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Books, 2014.
- "Population Clock." United States Census Bureau. Accessed September 17, 2016. <http://www.census.gov/popclock/>.
- Porges, Stephen W. "Social Engagement and Attachment." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1008, no. 1 (December 1, 2003): 31–47. doi:10.1196/annals.1301.004.
- Potok, Mark. "The Year in Hate and Extremism." *Southern Poverty Law Center*, February 11, 2016. <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/intelligence-report/2016/year-hate-and-extremism>.

- Prince. 1999. LP. Vol. 9 23720-1. 1999. Jacksonville, FL: WEA, 1982.
- Robertson, Robin. *Jungian Archetypes: Jung, Gödel, and the History of Archetypes*. Revised. New York: iUniverse, 2009.
- Rossi, Ernest Lawrence, and Kathryn Lane Rossi. "How the Mind and Brain Co-Create Each Other Daily." In *Imagination and Medicine*, edited by Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak, 135–68. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009.
- Rowland, Susan. *Jung: A Feminist Revision*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press, 2002.
- Ruether, Rosemary R. *Sexism and God Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1993.
- Sanford, John A. *Dreams: God's Forgotten Language*. San Francisco: HarperOne, 1989.
- . *Evil: The Shadow Side of Reality*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1986.
- Sarkar, Anil Kumar. *Whitehead's Four Principles from West-East Perspectives: Ways and Prospects of Process-Philosophy*. Patna: Bharati Bhawan, 1974.
- Segal, Robert A. "Jung on Myth." In *Teaching Jung*, edited by Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, 75–92. AAR Teaching Religious Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Sellery, J'nan Morse. "The Necessity for Symbol and Myth: A Literary Amplification." In *Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 93–104. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.
- Shelburne, Walter. *Mythos and Logos in the Thought of Carl Jung: The Theory of the Collective Unconscious in Scientific Perspective*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1988.
- Sherburne, Donald W., ed. *A Key to Whitehead's Process and Reality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Siivola, Markku. "Montague Ullman, Biographical Note." Accessed December 17, 2016. [http://siivola.org/monte/biographical\\_note.htm](http://siivola.org/monte/biographical_note.htm).
- Singer, June K. *Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung's Psychology*. Revised. New York: Anchor Books, 1994.
- Slusser, Gerald H. "Jung and Whitehead on Self and Divine: The Necessity for Symbol and Myth." In *Archetypal Process: Self and Divine and Whitehead, Jung, and Hillman*, edited by David Ray Griffin, 77–92. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1990.

- Smith, Jonathan A., Paul Flowers, and Michael Larkin. *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, Method and Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2009.
- Stein, Murray. "Jung's Green Christ." In *Jung's Challenge to Contemporary Religion*, edited by Murray Stein and Robert L. Moore. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1987.
- Sternberg, Esther M. "Can Believing Make You Well? A Decade Later." In *Imagination and Medicine*, edited by Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak, 79–106. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009.
- Tacey, David. "The Challenge of Teaching Jung in the University." In *Teaching Jung*, edited by Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, 13–28. AAR Teaching Religious Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Tarnas, Richard. *Cosmos and Psyche: Intimations of a New World View*. New York: Viking Adult, 2006.
- Taylor, Jeremy. "Ambiguities of Privilege." In *Dreaming in Christianity and Islam: Culture, Conflict, and Creativity*, edited by Kelly Bulkeley, Kate Adams, and Patricia M. Davis, 236–48. New Brunswick, NJ; London: Rutgers University Press, 2009.
- Thayer, Julian F., and Richard D. Lane. "Claude Bernard and the Heart–brain Connection: Further Elaboration of a Model of Neurovisceral Integration." *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, The Inevitable Link between Heart and Behavior: New Insights from Biomedical Research and Implications for Clinical Practice, 33, no. 2 (February 2009): 81–88. doi:10.1016/j.neubiorev.2008.08.004.
- The Pew Forum on Religion & Public Life. "'Nones' on the Rise." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, October 9, 2012. <http://www.pewforum.org/2012/10/09/nones-on-the-rise/>.
- The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 1615 L. "Political Polarization in the American Public." Washington, D.C.: Pew Research Center, June 12, 2014. <http://www.people-press.org/2014/06/12/political-polarization-in-the-american-public/>.
- "The Profound Power of Loneliness: National Science Foundation." *National Science Foundation*, February 3, 2016. [http://www.nsf.gov/discoveries/disc\\_summ.jsp?cntn\\_id=137534](http://www.nsf.gov/discoveries/disc_summ.jsp?cntn_id=137534).
- Tillich, Paul. *Systematic Theology, Volume I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.
- . *Systematic Theology, Volume III*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Ulanov, Ann Belford. *The Functioning Transcendent*. Wilmette, IL: Chiron Publications, 1996.
- Ulanov, Ann Belford, and Alvin Dueck. *The Living God and Our Living Psyche: What Christians Can Learn from Carl Jung*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2008.

- Ulanov, Ann Belford, and Barry Ulanov. *Religion and the Unconscious*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1985.
- Wagner, Suzanne. *Remembering Jung: Conversations About C. G. Jung and His Work*. DVD. Los Angeles: Bosustow Video Production, 1986.
- Watts, Alan W. *The Tao of Philosophy*. Audiocassette. Electronic University Publishing, 1995.
- Watts, Fraser N. *Theology and Psychology*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2002.
- Wehr, Demaris S. *Jung & Feminism: Liberating Archetypes*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.
- Wehrwein, Peter. "Astounding Increase in Antidepressant Use by Americans." *Harvard Health Blog*, October 20, 2011. <http://www.health.harvard.edu/blog/astounding-increase-in-antidepressant-use-by-americans-201110203624>.
- Weldon, Clodagh. "God on the Couch: Teaching Jung's Answer to Job." In *Teaching Jung*, edited by Kelly Bulkeley and Clodagh Weldon, 111–26. AAR Teaching Religious Studies. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Whitehead, Alfred North. *Adventures of Ideas*. Paperback. New York: The Free Press, 1933.
- . *Modes of Thought*. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- . *Process and Reality*. Edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne. Corrected. New York, London: Free Press, 1979.
- . *Religion in the Making*. Reissue. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927.
- . *Science and the Modern World*. New York: The Free Press, 1967.
- . *Symbolism: Its Meaning and Effect*. Revised. New York: Fordham University Press, 1985.
- . *The Function of Reason*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
- Woodman, Marion. "Coming to a Door." In *Imagination and Medicine*, edited by Stephen Aizenstat and Robert Bosnak, xi–xiv. New Orleans: Spring Journal Books, 2009.
- Young-Eisendrath, Polly, and James Hall. *Jung's Self Psychology: A Constructivist Perspective*. New York: The Guilford Press, 1991.
- Zimmerman, Michael E. "Quantum Theory, Intrinsic Value, and Panentheism." In *Postmodern Environmental Ethics*, edited by Max Oelschlaeger, 277–307. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995.